

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring permanent nonpartisan tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition of Daniel Lee Jamison, of Albany, N. Y., favoring bill for censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of tradespeople of Troy, N. Y., favoring fax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Papers to accompany House bill 5592, for pension for Sarah H. Benedict; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of William J. Emery and other citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., favoring pensions for widows of Spanish-War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of G. L. Calkins, of Battle Creek, Mich., favoring Federal censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7975, in pension case of Jonathan D. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petitions of Supreme Underwear Co., Climax Underwear Co., and Ritesize Underwear Co., of Utica, N. Y., for tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of Moving Picture and Projecting Machine Operators' Local Union No. 150, protesting against tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of Easton, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Lutheran Church of the Atonement, Easton, Pa., favoring Federal motion-picture commission; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. STINESS: Petitions of Rhode Island Processing Co., of Coventry, and Waurego Co. and Quinebaug Co., of Providence, R. I., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of L. I. Slocum, Lucy A. Slocum, H. L. Clark, R. E. Ayers, J. W. Smith, Eva Irene Smith, H. C. Bunker, and Mrs. Bunker, members of Dover local, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, Dover, Weld County, Colo., opposing increase of national armaments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: Petitions of Contoocook Mills Co., of Hillsboro; Granite State Mills, of Guild; Ashland Knitting Co., of Ashland; C. J. Amidon & Son, of Hinsdale; Hillsboro Mills Co., of Hillsboro; Henry Paper Co. and J. E. Henry & Sons Paper Co., of Lincoln, all in the State of New Hampshire, favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petitions of business men and others of Worcester County, Mass., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Millbury, Mass., favoring restoration of rural free delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, January 22, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, our Father in heaven, that through the terrible conflict now raging in half the world the good in man is pouring itself out to alleviate the sorrow and suffering of war's desolation. And we most earnestly pray that the good may reach the ascendancy in every heart; that wars may cease and man learn anew the lesson that where hate abounds strife, contentions, and wars abound, but where love abounds peace, joy, and harmony abounds; that the religion of brotherly love may have its sway and make the Old World blossom as the rose, and glory and honor and praise to Thee swell the mighty chorus round the world, "Peace on earth, good will toward men," forever and ever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent Mr. TILLMAN was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Charles W. Reeves, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, upon the request of Mr. WILSON of Louisiana, Mr. H. GARLAND DUPRE was granted leave of absence for 10 days, on account of important business.

RURAL POST ROADS.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7617.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, with Mr. BORLAND in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON].

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, Government aid to the States in the construction of roads has been a subject of controversy ever since the thirteen original States formed the Union. For 30 or 40 years after this Government was established it engaged in road building. Something like \$14,000,000 was expended on the Cumberland Road, and the work on this highway did not cease until after, or about, the beginning of the era of railroads.

For the past 80 years nothing of any importance has been done in that line by the General Government except the creation in the Department of Agriculture of the Office of Public Roads. This bureau, it affords me pleasure to testify, incidentally, has not only given very valuable object lessons in the construction of experimental roads, showing the best materials for different kinds of roads and the best methods of using them, but has materially aided the several States in their work of road building.

In the great scheme of Government aid to public-road construction, however, this is but a drop in the bucket. The States spent \$249,055,067 in road construction in the year 1914, and each year the amount increases. Meanwhile Congress has done nothing but talk about the matter. Bills enough have been introduced—some good, some bad, some indifferent—but none reached the point of enactment. Action, definite, conclusive action, has been too long delayed. It is high time something was done.

The State of Alabama, which I have the honor in part to represent, has made great progress in road construction within the last few years. The constitution of that State was amended by a vote of the people in the year 1901 so as to authorize the legislature to appropriate the net proceeds of the State convict department to aid in road building. Five years ago the legislature created a State highway commission and made an appropriation of \$2,000 per annum to each county out of the funds of the State convict department to aid in road building. I had the honor to be the author of this legislation. Up to that time but little interest had been taken in substantial road improvement in many of the rural counties in Alabama. Under the provisions of that law the county was required to put up an equal amount to that appropriated by the State. While these amounts were small and only a few miles of model highway could be built in each county, it was enough to demonstrate to the people the advantages of good roads and aided in the creation of a better sentiment for good roads. There were only 3,780 miles of improved roads in Alabama when this State highway commission was created on the 1st of April, 1911, and four years later there were 7,195 miles of improved roads in the State, an increase of more than 90 per cent. This was chiefly the result of the small amount of State aid. Alabama is taking the lead among the Southern States in road building. [Applause.]

If such a small amount of State aid accomplished this much, a larger amount of national aid, as provided by the bill under consideration, would accomplish much more. This refutes the argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that national aid would impair interest on the part of the States in road building. National aid will strengthen sentiment and interest for better roads in the States.

Several bills providing for national aid to roads have been introduced at this session. The one under consideration was introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Roads, and reported by that committee, of which I am a member. Some features of the bill I do not like. The old Members of the House who have been working for years for national aid to roads, a number of whom are members of the Committee on Roads, favor this bill and say that it is the best one that has ever been before Congress, and the only one that can pass both Houses of Congress.

at this time. I intend to vote for it even if it does not suit me in every respect, and when this bill is put on its passage I believe that every Member who favors national aid will vote for it and that it will pass the House by an overwhelming majority. It can be easily amended hereafter by Congress. But very few new laws are perfect. When Congress once adopts the policy of Federal aid to roads a good system will soon follow.

If the Department of Agriculture, as the representative of the National Government, and the State highway commissioners, as the representatives of the State, do their duty, and we must presume they will, every public road in every vicinity will receive its pro rata part of the money appropriated by Congress under the provisions of this measure.

This bill is, of course, only an authorization measure, which is the only kind the Roads Committee has jurisdiction to report. But as everyone knows the appropriation provided for in it will be reported by the Appropriation Committee and made by Congress if this bill is passed. The allotment to Alabama under the provisions of this bill amounts to \$578,750 per annum.

The idea has been expressed in various forms that a people's progress and civilization can be measured by the degree of attention it gives to the building and maintenance of public highways. If this were a truism and applied to the United States we would certainly rate low in the scale of civilization, for, taken as a whole, the condition of our public roads is pitiful, indeed. According to the latest bulletin issued by the Office of Public Roads, the total of all public roads in the United States is 2,273,131 miles, and of those only 247,490 miles, or 10.9 per cent, are surfaced. All the rest are old mud roads. Rather a disgraceful showing, is it not, for the wealthiest Nation in the world, that prides itself upon its up-to-date methods in everything that goes to promote the activities and comfort of the people.

It is demonstrated by history that no country has good roads except where the government has aided in their construction and maintenance. In European countries all of the public roads were completed many, many years ago. Of all civilized countries, it is said that this country has the poorest roads. In almost everything else it stands first; in natural wealth, agricultural products, in the manufacture of steel and iron, and in the number of miles of railroads we stand first; still the farmers who contribute so much to the greatness of our wealth have received less consideration and have had less done for them than any other class of our people.

The National Government, from an economic standpoint, can well afford to aid in road construction. There are 1,073,099 miles of rural free delivery routes and 147,580 miles of star mail routes in the United States, a total of 1,220,579. With good roads the service could be improved and extended, where it is very much needed, for the same amount of money; besides, it would be worth so much to those who carry the star route and rural mails, and who, in my opinion, are paid less for their services than any other class of employees in the service of the Government for the same amount of work, and who, I think, should be paid more than they are at this time. There are 878,798,000 acres of farm land in the United States, valued at \$128,475,674,000. Put the average increase by reason of good roads to farm lands at 50 per cent, which is very conservative, and it means an increase of about \$29,000,000,000 in the value of farm lands in the United States. Is not this worth while? It will not be amiss, Mr. Chairman, to point out another very material advantage from good roads. In these days home seekers prefer to travel in automobiles where the roads are good rather than on railroad trains. It affords him an opportunity to get more information about the soil, climate, and social conditions in the various communities than he could acquire by traveling upon the trains, and in this way furnish the communities which have good roads an opportunity to advertise the advantages of their country and to sell their surplus farm lands to desirable settlers at good prices.

As Members of this Congress we owe the people of the United States no greater service than to provide national aid to roads and a system of rural credits that would meet the demands of the times. [Applause.] The people have waited long enough for this legislation. They not only expect national aid for roads at this session of Congress, but the establishment of a system of rural credits that would meet the needs and demands of our people. Such a system as they have in many other countries, and which will enable our farmers to borrow money on a long-term installment plan at a low rate of interest, with which to pay off the mortgages on their farms, and enable those who do not own a farm to buy one, securing the money on a long-term installment plan at a low rate of interest that would enable him to pay for a home in a few years' time with less money than he would pay as land rent during that period. Time, however, will not permit me to make further reference to

that subject, but I shall have more to say on it when that measure comes before the House.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the leader on the Republican side, has expressed the opinion that the National Government will at some time go into the business of aiding in road building, and that when it does the appropriations will increase from year to year for that purpose; but that he does not think this is the time to begin. I fear if we leave it to those who oppose national aid to roads to say when we shall begin there will never be a beginning. [Applause.] Those who oppose this measure assign various reasons. Some say the condition of the Treasury will not permit of an appropriation for this purpose. This great Government can well afford it, and, if necessary, I would favor reducing other appropriations in order to secure money to aid in road building. [Applause.]

The most of the opposition to this bill, however, seems to come from Members of Congress representing districts in large cities, who base their opposition chiefly on the ground that it would be of benefit to the farmers alone. This would not be a valid objection, if it were true, but it is a mistaken idea. The cities of the country are dependent upon the products of the farms for their growth and maintenance. The products of the fertile farms of the Western States built and sustain, in a large measure, Kansas City, Chicago, and St. Louis. It can not be denied that the prosperity of the country depends upon the farmer. It is well known that when he is prosperous every other class prospers and when he does not all others suffer. Some of the Congressmen from city districts have suggested that Congress has done enough for the farmers in making provision for rural mails and parcel post. They seem to forget that these things are of as much interest to those who live in the towns and cities as those who live upon farms. If there should be an effort to abolish rural mails and parcel post, it would meet with as much opposition from the mail-order houses, publishers of newspapers, periodicals, and other business interests in the cities as from the farmers. They seem to have forgotten that millions of dollars have been spent by the National Government in the erection of post-office buildings in the cities, and that it was done under the same provisions of the Constitution of the United States that authorizes the Government to build roads. These post-office buildings are necessary, and the farmer makes no complaint; then, why are these gentlemen from the cities so narrow in their views as to oppose this measure, because it will be of some benefit to those who live in the country? They seem to forget that whatever is of benefit to those who live in the country is of benefit to those who live in the towns and cities. But even if this measure was only of benefit to farmers, which is not true, that would justify this Congress in making the appropriation, for more than half of our population live upon the farms, and they produced about \$10,000,000,000 of the wealth of this country last year. They own more than \$70,000,000,000 worth of property of the Nation, and pay more taxes—State, county, and Federal—than any other class of our citizenship. I am glad, however, to see a number of Members from the city districts, on both sides of the House, take a broader and more liberal view of the subject, and are supporting this bill.

According to calculations made by the Department of Agriculture, it costs the American farmer about 23 cents per ton per mile to carry his products from the farm to the railway station or river landing, and the annual charge for hauling of the 300,000,000 tons of products is estimated at \$600,000,000. A frightful burden, indeed, on the initial process of marketing the crops. If our public roads were in approximately as good condition as those of most countries of Europe this charge could be easily reduced by one-half or more. If ever they reach the perfection of the highways of France, two-thirds of this expense can be saved to the farmer. Just another illustration. It is shown by reports of United States consuls in Europe that the lowest cost of hauling produce from farm to market is in Hanover, the average running 4½ cents per long ton per mile; in Italy about 9 cents; in France, 11½ cents; in parts of Germany, other than Hanover, from 11 to 13 cents; in England, 12 cents. In the United States the hauling ranges, according to the products handled, from 19 to 27 cents per long ton per mile, the highest rate being on cotton. In other words, the American farmer pays from 40 to 95 per cent more to carry his products from the farm to the nearest railway station or river landing than the farmer in Europe. The only cause for this enormous advantage to the French or German or English or Italian farmer is the splendid highways which traverse these countries from one end to the other.

Let me make another striking comparison. I have already stated, and we all know, that this question of public roads has been discussed from every possible angle for years. In the course of one of these investigations about 20 years ago—and let

me say that the basic facts of the statement I am going to quote are as true to-day as they were then—Stuyvesant Fish, president of the Illinois Central Railroad, wrote a letter to Gov. Lowry, of Mississippi, in which he said: "Circular 19, Office of Road Inquiries, bears date April 4, 1896. The grand total of the annual cost of hauling farm products and lumber on public roads in the United States, there given as \$946,414,665, is based on data for the year ending June 30, 1895. In that year the gross sum received by all the railroads in the United States, from not only hauling all the freight but for also providing in addition the highways (railroads), the vehicles (cars), the motive power (engines), and drivers (trainmen), and paying taxes thereon, was only \$729,993,462; that is to say, it cost the farmer and the lumberman of the United States alone \$216,421,203, or, say, 30 per cent more in one year to haul their products on public roads than all of the railways received from freights of all kinds." [Applause.]

And as a clincher let me tell you that the cost of transportation per ton for 1,000 miles by steamship on the Great Lakes is \$1.25, by steam cars for 250 miles it is \$1.25, by electric power for 25 miles it is \$1.25, and by horsepower on any public road for 3 miles it is \$1.25. Does not this show the awful expensiveness of the farmer's work?

This Government has not been niggardly, Mr. Chairman, in the matter of appropriations for public improvements; roads, of course, being always excepted. The appropriations for irrigation projects in the fiscal year of 1914 were, in round figures, \$106,000,000. For improvement of rivers and harbor there has been appropriated from the beginning of our national existence to August 1, 1914, the sum of \$819,000,000, and on rivers alone \$475,211,250. To aid in the construction of the Pacific railroads the United States Government gave its credit for hundreds of millions of dollars in bonds and in land grants along the right of way of these railroads. The appropriation by Congress to the Panama Canal to June 30, 1915, amounted to \$394,399,149. Looking at these exhibits the proposition to appropriate \$25,000,000 annually as the Government's contribution to aid the States in the building of public roads appears excessively modest.

Why, Mr. Chairman, it will require little more than half of what the Government has granted for rivers and harbors to give the States necessary funds to improve every public road in the United States.

The farmers have not made much objection to these great appropriations to which I have referred, even though many of them did not derive much immediate advantage therefrom. They have realized all along that the commercial and industrial needs of the country require pecuniary sacrifices which must fall alike upon all people. They know a great part of our commerce must be carried by water because of the cheaper mode of this kind of transportation and that rivers should be made navigable to this end. Nay, more, it has been preached to them by every public speaker in and out of Congress that the prosperity of the Nation, the expansion of its domestic and foreign commerce, the increase of transportation facilities by land and by water makes for the farmer's benefit no less than for the manufacturer's and merchant's. While they have paid and are still paying their share of the huge expenditures involved in these operations of the Government they have complained, and do still justly complain, that Congress has not at the same time aided in building roads. The farmer has asked himself, as well he might, how he is benefited by the building of railways and the improvement of rivers if the roads that lead from his farm to the river landing or railway station or other market are in such wretched condition as to wear out his wagons and teams, and at times made impassable by heavy rains and freezes. The farmer will not reap full benefits from the expenditure of all these hundreds of millions of appropriations to which I have referred until the country roads are put in good condition.

Thus we see, no matter from what viewpoint we look at it, that the expense of marketing the products of the farm must remain inordinately high until all the roads are improved.

The National Government, Mr. Chairman, has not been chary in the expenditure of large sums of money for building public roads in our island possessions ever since we acquired control of them.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield?

Mr. GORDON. For a question in reference to our island possessions.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I am forced to decline on account of the limited time allotted to me.

The latest annual report of the Philippine Commission shows that in the five and a half years ended December 31, 1914, there was expended in the islands on public-road improvement the

very respectable sum of \$3,250,000. As to Porto Rico, the report of the Government for 1914 shows that the cost of construction of roads and bridges from the time of our taking possession of the island until June 30, 1914, was \$7,537,000. Not so bad for a territory little less in area than one-fourteenth of the State of Alabama. And the last Congress was generous enough to authorize the expenditure of \$35,000,000 for the construction of a railroad in Alaska. I confess, Mr. Chairman, that I am somewhat at a loss to account for the reluctance heretofore evinced by the Congress of the United States to make adequate money grants in aid of public-road building in the States, which in one single year have spent several hundred millions in this work. Why not be at least as liberal with the States which have waited for so, these many years as with these outlying Territories that came under our beneficent domination only a little while ago?

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, I attach the greatest possible importance to that provision of this bill which takes care of the improvement of the little county roads. It is all very well to talk of the great trunk highways which it is hoped will be built; but, after all, of what avail will those great highways be if their feeders, all the county roads, are not put in condition to enable the farmer to reach the greater arteries? The roads that run straight from the farm are the important links in the chain of road improvement; and just as the chain is no stronger than its weakest link, so the whole scheme of public-highway construction will be faulty unless the byways are first taken care of.

There is another fact in connection with this matter which must not be lost sight of, and that is the increase in the value of farm lands by reason of road improvement. Without going into detailed figures I will only state that the experience of landowners is to the effect that, in sections where roads have been properly constructed and properly maintained the value of the farms have doubled and sometimes quadrupled. It will be indeed a joyful day for the American farmer when he finds not only the cost of marketing his products reduced by one-half or two-thirds, but the value of his farm materially enhanced. Incidentally, it may also be pointed out that with the increase in the market value of the land will come increase in the treasures of the county and State, while the cost of maintenance is reduced to a minimum.

One of the vitally important effects of good public roads is the improvement of the social conditions of the rural population. It has been shown, for instance, that school attendance has been materially increased; social intercourse between the units of farming communities has become more frequent; the interchange of opinions on political, economic, and educational problems has been stimulated. In counties favored with good roads all the social activities of the community have received an impetus in a forward direction. So we see that the improvement of roads is not a question of material interest alone.

Another question of transcendent interest enters into the consideration of this matter of public-road building. It is the cost of living, not to the rural population merely, but to the dwellers in the city and town as well. We have all noted regretfully the steady and, I fear, ever increasing exodus from the farm to the city. The cause of it lies at the very threshold of the conditions surrounding farm life. The young people isolated from social intercourse, by reason of bad roads, are lured by the manifold attractions of the city, and the farmer has to pay more for his help, and the cost of production is increased. Either his already slight profits are still further reduced or, what is more likely to be the case, the cost of his product must be increased. This increase, of course, will grow in exact proportion as the producing class is lessened and the consuming class becomes more numerous. If some of our economists would figure out just how great are the losses sustained by this outgoing from farm to city, they would make a valuable contribution to the contemporaneous history of socioeconomic conditions.

In this day and time, with rural route mail facilities, telephone, and improved conditions of our schools and churches, if our public roads could be made good our lands would not only greatly increase in value, but country life would be more desirable, and the tendency of immigration from the country to the towns and cities would abate, and our young men and young women instead of going to the towns and cities would stay upon the farms.

From whatever point of view we regard this question of Government aid to the States in the construction and maintenance of good roads, we must be impressed with its exceeding importance. It embraces practically every relation of the human family. It enters into the commerce of the Nation, the taxation of property, the education of the children residing in the rural sections, the social relations of farming communities, the com-

fort of rural homes, even the religious activities of the people on the farm. There is hardly any one other subject which so nearly concerns all the people; for if it be true, as the great Napoleon declared, that agriculture is the chief concern of the State, then, indeed, nothing that Congress can do to further its development can be objected to.

It is not, therefore, so much a question of whether or not anything shall be done, but what is the best means to be employed to bring the largest possible benefits to the greatest number of our people. With this conviction firmly rooted in my mind, I shall give my heartiest support to the proposed legislation, which, in my judgment, promises to contribute in the fullest possible measure to the prosperity and happiness not only of the farmers, but to all our people. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN: The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON]. [Applause.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I also yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, this question of good roads has been permitted to entirely obscure the important question involved in the consideration of this bill.

Now, I think I am as strongly in favor of good roads as any man in this House. Good roads are vitally necessary to every civilized people. Bad roads operate as an export tax upon the product of the producer [applause], and if they are bad enough they absolutely destroy the value of the products of toil. So I want to record my position here and now as being heartily in favor of good roads, and at the same time, if I can, make clear to this House why I am strongly opposed to the passage of this bill.

Now, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON] who just preceded me referred to the good roads which were being built in the Philippine Islands, one of our colonial possessions; but I call the attention of the committee to the fact that those roads are built at the expense of the people of those islands, not at the expense of the people of the United States, and that makes all the difference in the world in the consideration of this question.

Members should not be confused by the different forms of government between that which is provided under the Constitution of the United States and that which is provided for the control of our colonial possessions. We are the sole governing power in the Philippine Islands, and this Congress, under the anomalous situation which obtains, is required to appropriate the money for all the expenses of those islands, but money for roads and other local improvements is raised by taxes imposed on the people of those islands.

Now, several gentlemen who have spoken upon this bill, attempting, I suppose, to give it some color of justification by the precedents in the history of the United States, have cited the one case which, it is contended, does furnish a precedent for this legislation, to wit, the Cumberland Road.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the legislation and the refusal to enact legislation by the Congress of the United States in connection with the Cumberland Road is the strongest possible argument against the enactment of this bill.

Now, what was the Cumberland Road, and when was it authorized, and under what circumstances?

The Congress of the United States, at the instigation of the President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson, in 1802, and at the time the admission of the State of Ohio into the Union was actually pending, passed a law authorizing the construction of a public highway from Cumberland, Md., to the Ohio River near Wheeling, W. Va., and in 1820 the act was amended to extend it to the Mississippi River and authorizing a survey of the route. In 1825 the first appropriation was made by Congress of \$150,000 to extend it west and extend the survey to the permanent capital of Missouri, and provided that it should pass through the capitals of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. On April 30, 1802, Congress passed an act enabling the people of Ohio to form a State government and seek admission into the Union. Section 7 contained the following provision:

That one-twentieth of the net proceeds of the lands lying within said State sold by Congress shall be applied to the laying out and making public roads leading from the navigable waters emptying into the Atlantic, to the Ohio, to the said State, and through the same, such roads to be laid out under the authority of Congress, with the consent of the several States through which the roads shall pass.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand the gentleman to say that he thinks this bill is unconstitutional.

Mr. GORDON. I have not said so yet. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON. Does the gentleman think that this bill is as constitutional as the bill which was up in the Sixty-third Congress with reference to good roads?

Mr. GORDON. Well, on that particular point, perhaps it is.

Mr. HARRISON. Did not the gentleman vote for that bill in the Sixty-third Congress?

Mr. GORDON. I did, sir. Now, that may be important; and if it is I will digress at this point to explain my change of attitude on this bill. [Laughter.] I voted for the bill in the Sixty-third Congress. These specious arguments that we have been listening to here, which never touched the real, vital objection to this bill, and my very strong predilection in favor of good roads and the lack of consideration of the merits of the proposition is my excuse and reason for having voted for it. So many questions commanded my attention at that time that I did not give this piece of legislation that careful investigation which I ought to have done before voting for it; but I have been endeavoring to make up for that since, and I think I now know something about my reasons, and the reasons which should impel others, to vote against this bill.

I was speaking of the Cumberland Road when I was interrupted. That was a very great improvement. But in 1822 the President of the United States, James Monroe, vetoed a bill the provisions of which undertook to impose tolls upon persons traveling upon that highway for the purpose of keeping it in repair. And I commend to the consideration of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], who interrupted me, the language of that veto message. The veto message itself is very short, but it was followed by a dissertation upon the powers of Congress and the relations of the Federal Government to the States which would well justify every Member of Congress and every intelligent citizen to read.

I will, Mr. Chairman, ask unanimous consent now to insert in the RECORD the short veto message of President Monroe upon that bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting the matter referred to. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

VETO MESSAGE.

WASHINGTON, May 4, 1822.

To the House of Representatives:

Having duly considered the bill entitled "An act for the preservation and repair of the Cumberland Road," it is with deep regret, approving as I do the policy, that I am compelled to object to its passage and to return the bill to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, under a conviction that Congress do not possess the power under the Constitution to pass such a law.

A power to establish turnpikes, with gates and tolls, and to enforce the collection of tolls by penalties, implies a power to adopt and execute a complete system of internal improvement. A right to impose duties to be paid by all persons passing a certain road, and on horses and carriages, as is done by this bill, involves the right to take the land from the proprietor on a valuation and to pass laws for the protection of the road from injuries, and if it exists as to one road it exists as to any other, and to as many roads as Congress may think proper to establish. A right to legislate for one of these purposes is a right to legislate for the others. It is a complete right of jurisdiction and sovereignty for all the purposes of internal improvement, and not merely the right of applying money under the power vested in Congress to make appropriations, under which power, with the consent of the States through which this road passes, the work was originally commenced and has been so far executed. I am of opinion that Congress do not possess this power; that the States individually can not grant it, for although they may assent to the appropriation of money within their limits for such purposes they can grant no power of jurisdiction or sovereignty by special compacts with the United States. This power can be granted only by an amendment to the Constitution and in the mode prescribed by it.

If the power exist, it must be either because it has been specifically granted to the United States or that it is incidental to some power which has been specifically granted. If we examine the specific grants of power, we do not find it among them, nor is it incidental to any power which has been specifically granted.

It has never been contended that the power was specifically granted. It is claimed only as being incidental to some one or more of the powers which are specifically granted. The following are the powers from which it is said to be derived:

First, from the right to establish post offices and post roads; second, from the right to declare war; third, to regulate commerce; fourth, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare; fifth, from the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution all the powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof; sixth and lastly, from the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property of the United States.

According to my judgment, it can not be derived from either or those powers, nor from all of them united, and in consequence it does not exist.

Having stated my objections to the bill, I should now cheerfully communicate at large the reasons on which they are founded if I had time to reduce them to such form as to include them in this paper. The advanced stage of the session renders that impossible. Having at the commencement of my service in this high trust considered it a duty to express the opinion that the United States do not possess the power in question and to suggest for the consideration of Congress the propriety of recommending to the States an amendment to the Constitution to vest the power in the United States, my attention has been often drawn to the subject since, in consequence whereof I have occasionally committed my sentiments to paper respecting it. The form which this exposition has assumed is not such as I should have given it had it been intended for Congress, nor is it concluded. Nevertheless, as it contains my views on this subject, being one which I deem of very high importance, and which in many of its bearings has now become peculiarly urgent, I will communicate it to Congress, if in my power, in the course of the day, or certainly on Monday next.

JAMES MONROE.

Mr. GORDON. Now, what was the condition of the country at the time the Cumberland Road was built and what were the circumstances of the construction of that great highway? The Northwest Territory had been ceded to the people of the United States by the State of Virginia. The first State to be carved out of that great Territory, Ohio, was then engaged in preparing a constitution and applying for admission to the Union under the authority of Congress. The State of Indiana was not admitted until 1816, Illinois in 1818, Missouri in 1821, Michigan in 1837, and Wisconsin in 1848. By subsequent legislation the Cumberland Road act was amended so as to extend its western terminus to Jefferson City, Mo., the home of the distinguished author of this bill, Judge SHACKLEFORD. The circumstances attending the enactment of that legislation furnished absolutely no precedent for this, and the considerations of James Monroe in his veto message, in which he forbade the use of the money of the United States Government for the purpose of maintaining this Cumberland Road, seem to me to furnish unanswerable reasons against it.

The road, as you know, was subsequently—

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. GORDON. I will in a minute. The jurisdiction over this road was subsequently transferred, as you know, to the States through which it passed, who thereupon imposed tolls for the purpose of defraying the expenses of keeping it in repair.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the Cumberland Road was built exclusively from the proceeds of the sale of public land?

Mr. GORDON. You did not. If you did, you misunderstood me.

Mr. MONDELL. That was true of the first legislation, I understood the gentleman to say.

Mr. GORDON. The act providing for the building of the road contained the provision that 5 per cent, one-twentieth of all the proceeds of the sale of public lands in the State of Ohio, and I believe the other Territories through which the road was to pass, should be appropriated to defray the expense of the construction of the road. The provision cited from the act of April 30, 1802, authorizing the people of Ohio to organize a State government, is referred to in the first act of Congress for building the Cumberland Road.

Mr. MONDELL. But the road was not built exclusively from that source?

Mr. GORDON. I am not prepared to say whether or not the proceeds of the sale of the land reimbursed the Government. Of course, appropriations were made directly out of the Treasury of the United States as the work upon the road progressed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GORDON. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Was it the custom at the time of which the gentleman speaks for the Congress to authorize loans upon public lands, the loans that were secured as a rule by foreign nations, partly for the construction of roads and sometimes for the construction of canals?

Mr. GORDON. I know of no such act of Congress.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is giving us an interesting historical discourse, and I am very much pleased with it. If it will not divert him too much, I would like to ask him whether he knows that prior to the reading of the dissertation of President Monroe, which is quite a lengthy message, as we know, that the Congress of the United States was asked to permit of the use of public lands for the purpose of

raising funds to build a canal to bring the Great Lakes to the sea, and whether, Congress having refused to make such a grant, the State of New York embarked upon that enterprise itself and constructed the present Erie or State Barge Canal?

Mr. GORDON. I am not prepared to dispute the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Considering many requests made of the Congress of the United States, I can believe almost anything might have been requested in times past. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I merely wanted the gentleman to know as a historical fact that Congress did reject the proposition to build the canal, and that it was built by the State of New York.

Mr. GORDON. I thank the gentleman. That furnishes, of course, another precedent against this bill.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman's legal objection to this bill that it provides for the building of roads within the States and not for interstate roads?

Mr. GORDON. That is just one of my objections to it; yes. My principal objection to this bill, Mr. Chairman, is stated in the report of the majority of the committee recommending the bill for passage, that it is purely a local matter for which you propose to ram your hands down into the Public Treasury of the United States and take out money. That is my principal objection to the bill, which I will elaborate as I progress.

Mr. KELLEY. Your objection is not legal, but you object to it as a matter of policy?

Mr. GORDON. Oh, I do not care what you call it. I suppose this House has a perfect right to pass upon the constitutionality of a measure when it votes upon it. I think it does pass upon its constitutionality.

Mr. KELLEY. I understood the gentleman was making a legal argument, and I wanted to make clear in my mind to just what point it was directed.

Mr. GORDON. I thank the gentleman for the compliment, if he considers what I have said in my time is a legal argument. It is not cohesive, and I am not depending so much on the law as I am on the logic of the undisputed facts.

Mr. CROSSER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield to his colleague?

Mr. GORDON. I will.

Mr. CROSSER. Not indicating my own position, I agree with you that we ought to regard the matter from the standpoint of philosophy and argument rather than figures. How far would the doctrine—this idea of having each locality build its own roads—take us? Supposing that we should pass a law in the States requiring each township or ward to build its roads and not requiring it to build any other ones. Would not that cause disastrous results?

Mr. GORDON. No. That is the law now in every State in the Union that I know anything of.

Mr. CROSSER. Another question.

Mr. GORDON. Very well.

Mr. CROSSER. Suppose some of the counties in the State would build and others not. Would it not prevent a free access from one county to another?

Mr. GORDON. Undoubtedly; but let those counties stew in their own juice until they get ready to tax themselves to build it. [Laughter.] If that interferes with interstate commerce, then I grant you that we might consider the question.

Mr. CROSSER. That is the point I am coming to.

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Now, this bill itself, in order to make it perfectly clear that it is purely a local bill and that it is intended to use this money to build and improve township roads, contains this provision:

Sec. 5. That the necessary culverts and bridges shall be considered as parts of the roads constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act; that the roads which may be constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act shall include earth, sand-clay, sand-gravel, and other common types of roads, as well as roads of higher classes, one of the purposes of this act being to encourage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into the adjacent farming communities.

Now, those roads are very desirable, Mr. Chairman; but those are roads of the kind that in my State and in every other State, so far as I know, are built by assessing a part of the cost upon the local community which receives the primary benefit from the construction of the road. We have in my State a system of road laws under which the State pays a portion and the local community pays a portion. We have a State highway commission which qualifies us to receive our apportionment under this act, but in the construction of roads our State highway commission does not pretend to go into townships and construct purely local roads. It does not understand its function to be any such thing as that. These local roads are built by taxing the

local communities. They are local improvements, just as this report says, and I know of no State in which they tax the people of the whole Commonwealth to build purely local roads.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The gentleman says that the State cooperates with the counties?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The local subdivisions of the State?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the gentleman think that policy a wise one?

Mr. GORDON. Yes; a very wise one.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then why can not the same policy be applied to the United States cooperating with the States and counties?

Mr. GORDON. I do not say it could not. Otherwise, I would not be here making this speech. I am trying to prevent its being applied. [Applause and laughter.]

Now, the question of the gentleman from Tennessee illustrates my point for me quite as well as I could do it myself. The relation between the States and their local subdivisions are entirely different from the relations between the Federal Government and the States. The latter relations are defined by the Federal Constitution, and the gentleman from Tennessee knows enough to know that there is no real analogy between the relations existing between the States of this Union and the Federal Government and the relations existing between the States themselves and their local subdivisions. They are local creations. For convenience the States, acting through their legislatures or their constitutions, subdivide for convenience the States into counties and townships, and enact the necessary legislation to give as nearly as may be in local affairs home rule and local self-government. The wisdom of that system has never been successfully challenged. And as an incident to their local control and self-government, they require them to pay their local taxes.

This talk that it is a nice thing to have good roads and that therefore you should vote for this bill is exceedingly fallacious. It is a nice thing to have these farms out in these States drained. Drainage is quite as vital and as essential as anything else.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. GORDON. I do.

Mr. WHEELER. If this bill should become a law and appropriations should be made, does the gentleman think that in the near future, or in the future at any time, it would affect his district? Or, in other words, are there any farmers in his district?

Mr. GORDON. Well, in answer to the gentleman's question, I will say that there are no farmers in my district, but all the roads in my district were constructed and paid for by the people of my district. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Is that the reason why the gentleman is opposed to the bill—because there are no farmers in his district? [Laughter.]

Mr. GORDON. Well, that is one reason, and a pretty good one, too. [Laughter.] Now, inasmuch as the gentleman called my attention to that fact, I think I understand my duty as a Member of the National Congress. I do not permit mere local considerations to control my attitude upon public questions; and if I did not think that this bill was a bad bill, regardless of its immediate effect upon my own constituents, I would not be here talking against it. [Applause.] I think it goes very much further than that.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. I understood the gentleman to say that the last time he voted for the roads bill and that this time he is very much opposed to it.

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. And the gentleman has given us some reasons why he has changed?

Mr. GORDON. Yes. And I will give you some more if you will give me the time. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON. The gentleman has just stated that he has no rural population in his district. I want to ask the gentleman what the farmers in his district, that were in his district in the Sixty-third Congress, think of this proposition? [Laugh-

ter.] I notice that there were three rural counties in the gentleman's district at that time. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORDON. I will say, in answer to that, that so far as the farmers living in my former district are concerned, they have, most of them, had their roads improved by the city of Cleveland. We have county-road laws in our State under which they have constructed in the county of Cuyahoga over 400 miles of brick roads outside of the city. We have more good roads than any other county in the United States.

This question is not new to us, and the reference of the gentleman to my former constituents is answered, I think, by my previous observation. I am not controlled by any such consideration as that. I think the reasons against this bill are very much deeper than any mere matter of local concern. I might just as well charge these gentlemen here, who represent rural constituencies, with voting for this bill solely and only because their constituents are in favor of good roads. [Applause.] That is the way some of them talk, and I believe it. [Laughter.]

Now, I read from the report of the majority of the committee, recommending the passage of this bill:

Roads are local concerns, and primarily it is the duty of the States to provide them for their people.

Now, I agree to that. I say that is a strong argument against this bill. In fact, there is the foundation of my objections to this bill.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. GORDON. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining. Mr. GORDON. No; I will not yield. You see my time has all been taken up by these questions and I have not been able to say what I wanted to say.

Jurisdiction over roads—

I still read from the report of the majority of the committee—Jurisdiction over roads belongs to the State and local authorities.

Yes; and James Monroe, in his veto message, said that Congress could not lawfully confer power and jurisdiction on the National Government in the matter of the repair and maintenance of roads by collecting tolls.

This jurisdiction should never be disturbed by the General Government.

I fully agree to that. It never will be disturbed, either, until you amend the Constitution of the United States. Now, as we have no jurisdiction over these roads, no power to supervise their maintenance, why should we take money out of the Treasury of the United States to build them? I wish the gentlemen on the floor of this House who are strongly in favor of good roads and who are supporting this bill would answer some of these vital objections suggested by their own report in support of the bill. That is the question that is bothering me. It is not a mere question of whether or not my district will get some of the "pork" that this bill provides for. I suppose my State will get its share. That is a very small consideration, however.

But in connection with the money involved I call your attention to the fact that they provide at the end of the bill that not more than \$25,000,000 shall be used the first year. You see this is providing a continuous performance of taking money out of the Treasury of the United States and expending it upon matters which are admitted and conceded by the committee itself to be purely local. I want you to understand, gentlemen, that this is a very serious proposition. When you enact this measure into law you are establishing a precedent for almost every conceivable form of local improvement to be made at the expense of the Public Treasury of the United States. [Applause.]

Furthermore, the law removing the rural counties from my district and enacting the present redistricting law was approved by the governor of Ohio on May 6, 1913, and the Shackelford road bill, which passed the House in the Sixty-third Congress, was not voted on until February 10, 1914, nine months and four days after the rural territory was separated from my district, so that the imputations involved in the questions, ascribing to me a desire to "pander" to the interests of my rural constituents in voting for the bill in the Sixty-third Congress, fall to the ground.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I have great sympathy for my friend from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] who has just taken his seat. Like all fresh Democrats when they come into this House, he has trouble with the Constitution of the United States. They

all do at first. Now, the Republican Members, new or old, never have any trouble with the Constitution of the United States if it gets in the way of doing something that they want done. Their protective tariff proclivities show exactly the measure of their ideas upon the Constitution of the United States; that is, their regard for it. If they would write into a tariff bill these words, "The object and purpose of this bill is to prohibit the importation of foreign merchandise into this country to be sold in competition with our own," it would be unconstitutional; but although that is the real purpose of it, if they say in the law it is to raise revenue, although it accomplishes an unconstitutional purpose, of course, the courts say, "We can not say that it will not produce revenue, we can not say that revenue will not follow from the operation of this act, and therefore it is constitutional."

Now, I want to say to my friend from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] that I have as much faith in him as anybody with reference to the effect upon him of the demands which his former constituents may have made upon him; but we are the creatures of our constituents, and if he, without having given a former bill thorough study, when he had three rural counties in his district, voted for it, and afterwards, when they were cut out of his district, gave it such further study as to enable him to arrive at his present conclusion, it is no reflection on him; we all give the benefit of the doubt to our constituents unless study or conviction rises higher with us than a desire to please our constituents. So I do not blame him, so far as I am concerned.

But let me say to my friend that the appropriation of money out of the Public Treasury for the purchase of garden seeds to give to private individuals is not a Government function.

Mr. GORDON. No; and I voted against it.

Mr. SIMS. Why, certainly; but does not the bill pass every time, and do the people not get the seeds, and do they not take them and make good use of them as individuals, but not in the performance of any Government function?

Mr. GORDON. Oh, well, that is no answer to my position.

Mr. SIMS. I myself believe in confining Federal appropriations to the maintenance of strictly Federal Government objects and purposes; but is taking care of the earthquake sufferers of Messina and Martinique a Federal Government purpose? Why, not at all; but it is within the purposes and impulses of humanity and human sympathy, and, after all, if we violate the Constitution in such an act, I have never known the Attorney General of the United States or anybody else to begin a suit to enjoin the payment of such an appropriation.

This bill is not my bill. In fact, I opposed, as vigorously as I knew how, the bill that came from the Agricultural Committee which provided for the payment of money for the use of roads by rural carriers to local authorities in the States at so much per mile, according to the quality and standard of roads. That proposition, as I regarded it, was simply a subsidy, upon condition that the States or local authorities appropriated the same amount for the same roads. I fought that bill all the way through, and voted against it on a ye-and-nay vote. Since then the Roads Committee has been created, and when the bill came from that committee last Congress, which provided for the possibility of the use of the money in the only way that it ought to be used, I voted for it.

Mr. Chairman, on the 10th day of December last I introduced the following bill, which is my scheme for the construction of Federal post roads. I want to say to you that in legislation no man can get exactly what he wants, and when I can not get my bill, but can get something to take the place of it, and out of which a great system may be established, I will not stand here in the pride of authorship and oppose a bill which accomplishes many of the objects and purposes of my own measure. Now I will read my own bill:

A bill to provide that the United States shall construct rural post roads between the county seats of the several States.

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to construct and maintain rural post roads the Postmaster General is authorized to designate all highways connecting county seats in each of the several States as rural post roads.

SEC. 2. That the Postmaster General, after making deductions hereinafter provided for, shall apportion the appropriations made under the provisions of this act for each fiscal year, among the several States in the following manner:

One-third in the ratio which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States; one-third in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census; one-third in the ratio which the mileage of rural post roads of each State bears to the total mileage of rural post roads in all the States.

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, the sum of \$25,000,000. So much of the appropriation apportioned to any State for any fiscal year as remains unexpended at the close thereof shall be available for expenditure until the close of the succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 4. That so much of the appropriation made under the provisions of this act as the Postmaster General may estimate to be necessary, not

to exceed 5 per cent, shall be deducted by him at the beginning of each fiscal year for administering the provisions of this act, and any portion of such amount unexpended at the close of any fiscal year shall be made a part of the appropriation for the succeeding fiscal year and reapportioned according to this act. Within 60 days after the final passage of this act, and thereafter on or before January 20 next preceding the commencement of the fiscal year, the Postmaster General shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount which he has apportioned to each State for such fiscal year. All payments under this act shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury on warrants drawn by the Postmaster General.

SEC. 5. The term "rural post road" as used in this act shall be deemed to include all public roads over which the United States mails are or may be transported, that connect the county seats of contiguous or adjoining counties. The Postmaster General shall cause to be made such surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates as he may require, and shall advertise for bids for all of the work or do the work as may otherwise be provided for by the laws of the United States.

SEC. 6. All road work in the several States done under the provisions of this act shall be under the direct supervision of the Postmaster General. The final cost of the work shall include a reasonable expense for engineering, inspection, and unforeseen contingencies not to exceed 10 per cent of the total cost of the work.

SEC. 7. That out of the appropriation provided by this act the Postmaster General is authorized to employ such assistants, clerks, and other persons, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, to rent such buildings in the city of Washington and elsewhere, to purchase such supplies, material, equipment, office fixtures and apparatus, and to incur such travel and other expenses as he may deem necessary for carrying out the purpose of this act.

SEC. 8. That the Postmaster General is authorized to make rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. That the Office of Public Roads, Department of Agriculture, shall be transferred to the Post Office Department.

SEC. 10. That in order to carry out the provisions of this act, the Postmaster General is authorized, by contract or condemnation, to acquire all needed rights of way, and to pay for such rights of way out of any moneys appropriated under this act.

SEC. 11. That roads constructed under this act shall be of uniform standard of width and quality and of hard surface, and upon an average shall not exceed in cost the sum of \$10,000 per mile.

I confined the construction of roads by my bill to such roads as lead from one county seat to county seats of each adjoining county under the idea that there necessarily must be a large amount of mail, including the parcel post, moving between county seats. And, it being a postal facility, the moving of mail matter, I have placed it where I thought it ought to be, under the Postmaster General, because all these bills that have been introduced have been in the nature of preparing post roads.

I propose that the Government of the United States, out of its own money, without any cooperation or consent of the States or the counties, shall build post roads from each county seat in each State to each and all adjoining county seats, even where State lines had to be crossed. That is a real Federal road and performs a regular Federal function. I never believed in State aid for the Federal Government in performing an exclusively Federal service. What is going to be the result of the increase in the parcel post? It is purely a transportation service. The carrying of a letter is purely a transportation service. If you can carry one pound of ordinary merchandise as a Federal function, as far as constitutional authority is concerned, you can carry a ton or a thousand tons, and if you can carry a ton you have a right to provide facilities for most economically and cheaply moving that ton of freight. This bill we are now considering in effect potentially covers every road in the United States, covers all the State public roads, covers all the county public roads—in fact, may cover all the public roads. One of the objections I have to the bill now being considered is that the title misleads. In the latter part of this bill is expressed the real object and purpose of it, and it should not be limited in the title as this bill is limited. The title of this bill is:

A bill to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

I hope the committee will offer an amendment that will so amend the title of the bill as to include all purposes for which these roads can be used, and not limit it to postal use only, because upon that we might have questions of construction and a controversy arise. The Secretary of Agriculture might say, when a proposed plan was put up to him, that we did not need all the roads proposed for the Postal Service only. A mere declaration that all roads may be so used is different from the practical application of such a declaration to all the roads. Why not let it go under the general-welfare clause that covers everything under heaven and includes every national purpose for which roads may be used? I hope the title will be so amended that the use of money will not be restricted to postal roads.

We southern Democrats are very much afraid of paternalism; we are in favor of State rights, but when the States are not able to give their citizens such improvements as will enable the people themselves to rise in the scale of civilization and national usefulness, and if it should be deemed necessary we ought to introduce a resolution to amend the Federal Consti-

tution, so that the National Government may be enabled to do that which the States, at least some of them, can not do for themselves, that is necessary to be done in order to have uniform national development.

I am in favor of any proposition that can be enacted into law that will give good roads to the whole Nation, but if the Constitution stands in the way of so good a thing we ought to amend it. We have done it before and we can do it again. But I take it that the lawyers on the committee have investigated this matter and find that it will stand the constitutional test. All I ask of the committee is that, if you can not get your bill through another body in the present form and you can get mine through, or something like it, to do so, so that good-road legislation will not be an absolute failure. I voted against a former bill, and I am glad I did and that it failed, for this is the best bill that has ever been reported to the House. It distributes the fund according to the population and road mileage, and I do not believe there is a Secretary of Agriculture living, or ever will live, that will dare to approve automobile roads laid out in a State and deny people who haul corn, wheat, cotton, and other farm products an opportunity to have their roads improved.

Of course this \$25,000,000 is just a starter. It ought to be a starter. We have got to have time to prepare for the work on the roads and to acquire road machinery and to put our things in working order; but the day will come when instead of spending \$25,000,000 a year we will spend \$200,000,000 a year, perhaps \$500,000,000 for this most justifiable purpose. [Applause.] But the more we spend economically and scientifically, the sooner will the country be redeemed from its present condition of primitiveness.

In the Southern States the bridges were all destroyed—nearly every one of them—during the Civil War. Our courthouses were practically all destroyed—burned up—our public buildings of every kind, including colleges and schoolhouses, lodges, and churches were burned or destroyed, so that we could not with our limited taxable resources improve our roads like the Northern States have improved theirs. We had to first restore these absolutely necessary structures. I hope and pray that however much you may love the Constitution, and nobody loves it more than a Democrat, that we will not let a constitutional doubt stand in the way of that which will benefit every section of the country in the United States. Let us give the people the benefit of the doubt, and if the courts should eventually solve the doubt against the validity of the law, its execution in the meantime will have redounded to the greatest general public good.

The construction of highways is one of the public purposes for which, I believe, both National and State Governments exist, and, I think, it is prudent and wise if necessary to issue bonds for their construction. If the construction is good, maintenance cost will be correspondingly light, while if the construction is poor, maintenance will be a burden almost beyond the power of the States or the Federal Government to bear.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOOHER). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this legislation. It has been my pleasure to support a measure somewhat similar to this one; it passed the House but nothing was done toward its passage in the Senate, but I trust that a better fate awaits this one at the other end of the Capitol. Many years ago this Government realized the importance of railroad building, and it donated to railroad companies for that purpose millions of acres of public land. These railroads have greatly developed the country and provided splendid agencies for commercial intercourse between the various sections of the country. But, Mr. Chairman, the work of road encouragement and road building is only half done and the good to be derived only half realized until we build a system of public roads throughout the rural sections of this great country. [Applause.]

The railroads are not doing the amount of good or rendering the highest measure of service to the people generally because the means of communication between railroads and the great farming class of our people are poor and inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, when this country can boast of a splendid system of country roads leading from the homes and farms of the rural districts to the railroads traversing the country, bringing the producer into quick and easy reach of the marts of trade, we will have contributed to the material prosperity, the well-being, and happiness of millions of American people. [Applause.]

This Government is now expending vast sums of money teaching the farmer how to increase the productivity of the soil and how to farm under scientific methods, and now it is incumbent upon us to set ourselves to the task of removing the difficulties and obstacles that stand as barriers between the farmer's produce and the markets on the railroad. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, if the time should ever come when we would need these highways in case of war they would serve us well. We would then need such roads as they have in Germany and France. Napoleon did no greater service to France than that rendered in building a system of public roads in that country. Our country is too great, powerful, and rich to longer permit these roads in the rural regions of the country to remain as a handicap and hindrance to the growth and development of our rural population. [Applause.]

The completion of such a system of roads as this bill contemplates will bring to the farmer new opportunities, promise, and possibilities, and bring to him comforts and conveniences long desired, and bestow blessings and benefits that can come through no other governmental action. [Applause.] It will enhance the value of his property and make life on the farm more attractive, and by the passage of such a measure, Mr. Chairman, we will contribute to the substantial growth and development of our agricultural classes and enable those who toil to produce that which feeds and clothes the world to reach with their produce the markets of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE].

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I have no particular desire to attempt to make a speech, but I do wish to express my views upon this bill, not in any spirit of criticism, but rather as representing what I deem to be the sentiment of the district which I have the honor to represent. I want to say also that I am proud to be a humble Member on this side of the aisle, with these veteran Republican leaders, and particularly our great leader—leaders able, astute, farsighted, having only and always at heart the public interest, leaders who in their distinguished careers in this House have frequently and persistently pointed out the clear and sure way to general prosperity in this country, not prosperity that is spasmodic and unhealthy, but prosperity based upon the healthful commercial, agricultural, and industrial activity of the people.

There are many reasons why I oppose this bill. One of them is because, in my judgment, Federal aid in the construction of roads under this act would be a form of paternalism that ought not to be instituted nor fostered by the Federal Government. I am in favor of good roads. We all are. The great State that I represent in part has in the last few years spent upward of \$100,000,000 in constructing and improving the roads in the State. We are preparing to expend millions more this year and expect to spend millions hereafter every year. I think, perhaps, that one great incentive to this road building in my State was the agitation of the automobilists and the tourists. They certainly gave us no rest, and I think that in the agitation which they started and continued it must be conceded that they rendered a great public service.

I think that this bill has been very skillfully drawn in the interest of those who expect to participate under its provisions; but so far as the bill itself is concerned, so far as getting any practical results from the working of the bill, in my legal judgment it is as full of holes as a sieve. As I understand it, under this bill—and if I am in error I will stand corrected—the State of New York would get as her apportionment about \$1,500,000, and in return her proportion which she would ultimately stand, based upon an annual appropriation of \$25,000,000, would be something like \$4,500,000, or upward of \$5,000,000. In other words, the State of New York under this bill would contribute each year for the purpose of building roads in other States—1,000, 2,000, or 3,000 miles away—something over \$3,000,000 a year.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully decline to yield. I have sat here now nearly 40 days listening to an almost continuous talkfest, and I think I am entitled now to 10 minutes.

Mr. HULBERT. I ask the gentleman to yield for one question.

Mr. MAGEE. I want to say further that I decline to yield. All the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle might as well understand that all the ballast in the ship of state is not contained in one section of the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, it has been suggested here that the Northern and Eastern States, California, perhaps, and other States are opposed to this bill. It has been insinuated that they are niggardly, narrow-minded, and all that sort of thing. Now, so far as the

State of New York is concerned, I will eliminate that part, and I do not put my objection upon that ground.

If you can mulct the State of New York that is willing to build her own roads, if you can mulct her to build roads 2,000 miles away in other States, and get away with it, why, I will take off my hat to you. But what I say is that I base my opposition upon principle. New York State has always been generous. She built the Erie Canal and made it free, thus conferring great advantages on many other States. We are now building as a substitute therefor the new Barge Canal which will cost the State upward of \$130,000,000. We have expended millions upon millions of dollars upon our highways, and I want to say that the great State of New York, with its 10,000,000 of people, being substantially one-tenth of the population of this Republic, with its unlimited wealth and boundless resources, with its great liberality and its intense loyalty, yields to no other State in this Union.

The instance cited here that the Government contributed in building the great transcontinental railroads is not analogous and can not be applied to this bill. Those were great transcontinental railroads joining with links of steel other roads for extension across the continent, great inland arteries of commerce binding the States together into an indissoluble union. If the purpose before the House was to build a Federal road for the purposes of the Federal Government, I would not rise in my seat and object. If it were to build a great road across this continent for automobilists and tourists and purposes of general traffic, I would not rise to object. Even if it were to build a road between the States, joining great centers of population, where you might say it would serve the purposes of interstate commerce, I would not object. But that is not this bill. This bill is to provide for an indiscriminate building of roads in the States, the building of a road from some railroad station to some farmer's home. That is what it means.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAGEE. Can the gentleman from New York yield me five minutes more?

Mr. DUNN. I yield five minutes additional to the gentleman.

Mr. MAGEE. And, Mr. Chairman, before I forget and conclude I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAGEE. Now, I do not believe, while I have not examined the question carefully from a legal standpoint, that the Federal Government has power under the Federal Constitution to build a road from a railroad station to some farmer's home.

There is no connection between this bill and the Post Office Department. There appears to be a sort of inference from this bill that ultimately it might improve rural post roads, but there is not anything that the Post Office Department or the Postmaster General has to do with the building of these roads. This is entirely clear, as shown by section 2 of the bill. The real purpose of the bill, in my judgment, is shown at the end of section 5, which provides for the building of private roads from railway stations to farmers' homes.

Again, this act, in my opinion, is not a workable act in the public interest, in that it fails to fix upon some authority an affirmative and imperative obligation to maintain a constructed road in a reasonably safe condition for public use.

The maintenance of a road is fully as important as the construction thereof. In the maintenance of a road in a reasonably safe condition for public travel it is not practicable, in my judgment, for a State highway department to submit to the Secretary of Agriculture surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of the cost of maintenance as a basis of agreement for the final determination as to what proportion of such cost the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, will consent to pay. When a culvert or bridge or roadway needs repairs, public safety demands that such repairs shall be promptly made and that the responsibility therefor can not be shifted nor evaded. The primary responsibility to maintain a constructed road in a safe condition should be fixed and determined as a reasonable guaranty of prompt action by some duly constituted authority. When an act in reference to maintenance authorizes dickering as to cost and discretion as to action no practicable results in the public interest can, in my judgment, be attained thereunder.

Again you appropriate \$25,000,000 a year, or authorize it. It is only a starter. Ten years from now, if you institute this form of paternalism, you will be asking for \$250,000,000. There are 1,200,000 miles of rural post roads, as stated here yesterday, and about 2,000,000 miles of roads in the entire coun-

try. Why, what could you do with \$25,000,000? If you deduct the amount deemed necessary for the administration of the act, say, \$5,000,000—it does not make any difference whether you say one million or five million, but say \$5,000,000—you will have twenty millions left; or, on all of the roads of the country an average of about \$10 a mile, not enough to fill up the spring mudholes.

So when you talk about this building of roads as a method of preparing the Nation for national defense, why, I would like to ask you, if this is your plan of preparedness, how many centuries it would take to get the roads of this country in a condition for national defense? [Laughter.]

Now, I am for national defense. I think we ought to do something. I think we have a great Government here. I think that this Nation to-day, as in the days of old, is a Nation of patriots, as the world will see if the test shall ever come. Now, let us do something. Let us give our energy and our resources in solving wisely the serious problems confronting this Government. We want a strong modern Navy for national defense. [Applause on the Republican side.] A Navy, and a strong Navy, is the best safeguard for peace. We need a Navy deemed sufficient by our naval officers and experts to defend and uphold at any time or place the honor, the dignity, and the traditions of this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. DUNN. I yield two minutes additional to the gentleman.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I will not take more than one minute. I simply want to say that I would not feel that I was worthy to be a Member of this House, Republican as I am, and I have even been called a black Republican, unless I could place loyalty above my party and the interests of my country above every other consideration, and I look into the faces of you gentlemen across the aisle and take you by the hand and say: Let us act together, let us work harmoniously, zealously, and earnestly in the performance of our duty in placing this great country of ours in a state of reasonable preparedness. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In my judgment we have a Government not only worth fighting for but worth dying for, and any American who is unwilling to fight for his country in her defense, and, if needs be, unwilling to die for his country in her defense is, in my judgment, unfit for American citizenship. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Has the gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNN] another speaker?

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS].

Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am aware of an unwritten rule which prevails in this body that a new Member should not with unseemly haste inject himself into the deliberations of the House and that he should not assume to take part in the discussion upon this floor until he has at least acquainted himself reasonably well with the rules and practices of the House. I do not find fault with this rule, as I believe its observance is alike beneficial to a new Member and to the House, and I do not wish to seem to violate even the spirit of this very sensible rule; but in view, Mr. Chairman, of the fact that I have the honor to be a member of the Committee on Roads, which has considered and reported this bill to the House, I have felt that I would be justified in making a few remarks in favor of its passage. [Applause.]

The legislation proposed in this bill is of very great importance to the whole country and is of vital interest to the people of the State of Illinois, and particularly to that section of the State which I have the honor to represent upon this floor.

The bill under consideration provides that the General Government shall extend aid to the various States in the construction and maintenance of public roads, applying particularly to post roads and roads over which the mails are carried by the Free Rural Delivery System.

By the terms of the bill an amount not exceeding \$25,000,000 shall be appropriated annually and shall be disbursed by the Secretary of Agriculture. The amount apportioned to each State is to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following manner: Sixty-five thousand dollars to each of the States and one-half of the remainder to each State in the ratio which the population of such State bears to the population of all the States as shown by the latest available Federal census, and the other half of such remainder in the ratio which the mileage of rural free delivery and star-mail routes in such State bears to the mileage of rural free delivery and star-mail routes of all the States as shown by the latest available report of the Postmaster General.

The bill is constructed upon the theory that public roads are local concerns and that it is primarily the duty of the States to provide them for their people. Jurisdiction over the roads is not sought to be disturbed by any provision of the pending bill, but is left where such jurisdiction now lies, with the several States. It is merely proposed to grant aid and assistance to the various States for the construction and maintenance of public roads, leaving the States free to build and construct their own public roads of whatever character they may desire and in their own way, subject, of course, to the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture on each road where Federal aid is granted.

The plan adopted for the distribution of the aid to be granted to the various States is, in the judgment of the members of the committee, the most equitable and satisfactory of any suggested to the committee. No plan that was considered by the committee was wholly free from objections, but the plan finally adopted by which each State receives a minimum of \$65,000 with its pro rata share of the balance of the fund based on population and miles of public road in each State, over which the mails are carried, appeared to be the most acceptable and workable of any considered by the committee.

Under this plan of distribution the State of Illinois will receive \$1,372,330.

There is a very general and wide-spread demand throughout the country for legislation of this kind. The sentiment for Federal aid in the building and maintaining of our public roads is not confined alone to the residents of the rural communities, but exists among all classes of our people. Some of the most enthusiastic advocates of the proposition for Federal aid in road construction being large-minded and public-spirited professional and business men residing in the cities.

It has been urged against the enactment of legislation of this character, that an appropriation such as is contemplated in this bill can not constitutionally be made. This argument, however, is not seriously urged of late years, in view of the ever-expanding activities of the Federal Government, covering such exercise of power as the purchase of Louisiana and Alaska, and the immense and ever-recurring appropriations for the improvement of our harbors and interior rivers, for reclamation service, for educational work, and the many and varied activities of the Government in other fields.

The Constitution provides that the General Government may establish post offices and post roads, may regulate commerce between the several States, may provide for the common defense, and may do those things that promote the general welfare. This appropriation can be constitutionally made under that section of the Constitution giving the Congress the power to establish and maintain post roads, and upon the broad, general ground that the proposed legislation will promote the general welfare and provide for the common defense. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing that will conduce more to the general welfare of the whole country than the improvement of our country roads. Good roads are not only a necessity and an inestimable blessing to the residents of the rural communities but are a powerful factor in the growth, development, and prosperity of every section of our common country. From an economic standpoint, the problem of good roads is not surpassed in importance by any other subject now before the American Congress. The problem of transportation goes to the very foundation of the development and prosperity of any nation. Better, cheaper, and additional transportation facilities in the United States must benefit every inhabitant and result in more development and greater productiveness of our natural resources, meaning more and cheaper food and necessities of life.

All the great nations of the past of which history gives any account were builders of great systems of public roads. The histories of ancient Egypt, of Babylon, and of Rome tell us of the building and construction of great public roads by those historic and powerful peoples. These roads were used in the transportation of goods and merchandise in times of peace and for the use of great armies in times of war. When Rome was at the height of her glory under the reign of Augustus Cæsar, 29 great military roads, reaching every part of that great world Empire, radiated from the capital city. It is estimated that at that time the total mileage of improved roads in the Roman Empire was at least 50,000 miles. Many of these roads remained in fair repair for centuries, and long after the star of Roman greatness had ceased to shine in the firmament of nations these roads remained a monument to Roman power and achievement. [Applause.]

The greatest and most lasting exhibition of the genius of the first Napoleon was the magnificent system of public roads he gave to France. These roads constructed by Napoleon have been improved and kept in repair by the Government of France, and it was due to their splendid condition that the rapid and

easy mobilization of the armies of France and their speedy transportation to points was made possible at the outbreak of the present war in August, 1914.

The inestimable benefit of a system of highly improved public roads in time of war was demonstrated in the most striking manner in the instance just cited. France was absolutely saved from destruction by her thoroughly adequate and highly improved system of public roads.

In the contest between the armies of Germany and Russia along the eastern front of the present great war in Europe the part played by a system of good roads in war has also been most forcibly demonstrated. Germany, with her admirable system of improved public roads connecting every part of the Empire, has been able to handle her troops, shifting them to and from different fronts, at a very great and telling advantage over Russia, whose public roads, from the best information I can gather, are very similar and in about the same condition as the public roads in the United States.

When the history of the present war in Europe is finally written it will be seen that there has been no more important factor in the whole conflict than the transportation facilities of the various nations over their public roads. I would not at all be surprised if it should be the verdict of impartial history that this was the most important, if not the determining, factor of the whole war.

So, Mr. Chairman, at this grave crisis in the history of the country, when our people are thinking and talking so much about "preparedness" and the "national defense," the Congress can not afford to ignore the important factor that a system of good roads will be in any comprehensive plan of defense that may be considered.

The money that we spend at this time and in the future in developing a system of good roads throughout the Republic will prove to be of the greatest value as a means of defense in time of war, should that sad day ever come. It will not only be a bulwark in time of war but will add greatly to our prosperity, growth, and happiness in time of peace.

It must be admitted that in the building of public roads the American people have not kept pace with their splendid progress along almost every other line of growth and development. We have the greatest and most efficient railroad system in the world, a system that in most of the States reaches almost every important center, and in many places reaches every nook and corner of the State. The several States and the General Government for decades have encouraged the building and extension of our railroads, and in many instances have rendered the railroads great assistance by giving to them large and valuable portions of the public domain and by subsidies and concessions of one kind and another.

The development of our magnificent system of railroads has been one of the main factors in the marvelous growth and prosperity of the country, and no one seriously questions the wisdom of the policy that has lent the aid and encouragement of the General Government and of many of the States to this great work.

While we have been doing this the Government has almost entirely overlooked the very important duty of encouraging and assisting in the building of the public roads of the country. This highly important duty should now be recognized and assumed by the Federal Government.

The farmers of the country are unanimously in favor of the legislation proposed in this bill. They feel, and justly so, that the cost of building and maintaining a system of improved roads throughout the rural districts is too great a burden to be carried by them alone. They believe also that, inasmuch as the public roads belong to and are used by all the people of the country, the general public should bear a reasonable proportion of the great burden of their building and cost of maintenance.

If a public road running past the home of a farmer belonged to him personally, or if it was constructed for his own exclusive use and benefit, there might be some logic to the argument that it is his duty to build and maintain the same. If the highways of a given community in a rural district belonged exclusively to those who live in that particular community and if they had the exclusive right to the use of them, it might with some force be contended that the general public should not be called upon to assist in the cost of building and keeping in repair such highways. But such is not the case. A public road is such in fact as well as in name, and every citizen of the country has a legal right to its free and unrestricted use.

The country roads belong to all the people. Until recently the whole problem of building country roads has been considered a local problem and a local burden for each separate rural community to work out for itself, and as a conse-

quence of this neglect and this shortsighted policy on the part of the Federal Government and of the States there has been comparatively little progress in permanent road building in many of the States. This neglect has operated to the very great injury of the rural sections and has hindered and delayed the proper growth and development of those sections more than any other one thing.

Recognizing that the making of country roads was more than a local problem for each of the many thousands of rural communities to solve each for itself, there has been in recent years legislation in most of the States establishing State highway commissions, and in many of the States legislation has been enacted providing State aid to the local subdivisions in the construction of permanent good roads. In some of the States where State aid is not granted the State highway commissions, however, are granted powers authorizing them to work in harmony and conjointly with county or local road officials in some general scheme or system of road building and road improvement.

Legislation of this character in the various States has proven very beneficial in stimulating a widespread interest for better roads. It has also resulted in many States in considerable progress being made and much work actually being done in the construction of improved roads.

State aid has naturally led to a more insistent demand for aid of the Federal Government, and this sentiment for Federal aid has now grown until it is, as I said before, widespread, and there is nothing this Congress can do in the way of general legislation and that will prove as popular with the people or that will be as far-reaching in the benefits it will bring to the whole country as to pass this bill and enter upon the policy of national aid in the construction of country roads.

This policy, if adopted now, will not be changed nor receded from in the years to come. Future Congresses will improve upon this legislation, and the amount appropriated will grow from year to year, and the various States and the local subdivisions of the States, encouraged and stimulated by the generous aid and encouragement of the Federal Government, will take up this great work in earnest and carry it forward until all the main roads in every rural section of America become improved roads, and this great network of improved country roads will radiate from every city in the Union to every country village and rural community, and our rural population will be able to avail themselves of every advantage of city life and the people of the cities and villages can readily avail themselves of all the benefits and all the pleasures of close and easy contact with the wholesome influences of country life.

Mr. Chairman, the Government of the United States uses every day in the year 1,200,000 miles of country roads in the carrying of its mails by the star route and the Rural Delivery System. The Government certainly owes some obligations toward the upkeep and construction of this 1,200,000 miles of public roads that it uses daily. No one, it seems to me, can seriously contend otherwise.

In presenting this bill to the House, the chairman of the committee, Mr. SHACKLEFORD, says in his report:

To carry and deliver the mail is a function of the Federal Government, and it is its duty to provide itself with the facilities necessary to a proper performance of this function, such as postmasters, post offices, and post roads. A post road is just as truly a postal facility as is a post office. As in most rural communities it has been found less expensive and more expedient to rent post offices than to build them, so it would be less expensive and more expedient to use the roads of the States as post roads than it would be to construct and maintain an independent system. In such cases it would seem but just that the General Government should make some contribution to the construction and maintenance of the roads which it uses.

In times past, when the volume and weight of the postal matter were negligible, the interests of the General Government in the roads were not substantial, but with the advent of rural free delivery came a Federal necessity for better roads, and with the now rapidly expanding parcel post that necessity has become acute.

The language of this report sums up in a nutshell the duty of the Government in regard to post roads, and to me it appears unanswerable. It is just as reasonable and just as logical to contend that the cost of the erection of a Federal building to be used as a post office in a city should be borne by the citizens who happen to live in that city as it is to say that the whole cost of the burden of making and maintaining public roads over which the mail of the Government is carried in the country should be borne by the farmers who happen to live along those roads.

The absurdity of the former proposition is apparent at first blush and the latter will appear equally so when it is once considered. No one would think or say that the citizens of New York, Chicago, San Francisco, or even any of our smaller cities, should, at their own expense, put up the necessary buildings and furnish all the facilities for handling the mails in such cities.

Should the farmer, then, be required to bear all the burden in building and maintaining the public roads over which the Government carries its mails into the rural districts? To single the farmers out as the one class that Uncle Sam requires to bear this burden looks like discrimination. It is discrimination against the 45,000,000 of our population who live in the country. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the farmers pay a very large part of the revenues of the Government that go into the Federal Treasury—a larger part in proportion to their wealth than any other class of our citizens. They have received in return from the Federal Government in the way of appropriations for their benefit less than any other class. Uncomplainingly, year after year and decade after decade, they have seen their millions go through Federal appropriations to the aid of rivers and harbors, for the erection of great and imposing public buildings in all our cities, for expensive and elaborate coast defenses for the citizens living along the seaboard, and for a thousand other purposes.

Not only have they borne a large part of the burdens of Government in taxation, receiving very little, if anything, directly in return, but in times of war they have unstintingly given to the Nation their sturdy sons, who have loyally defended the flag on land and sea. [Applause.] I heartily concur in the sentiments expressed by my friend from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], when replying to the criticism made against this bill, that it was special legislation in the interest of the farmers, he said:

I do not admit that the statement is true; but if it were, it would not be for an unworthy or ignoble purpose.

Why should Congress not legislate for the farmers after all these years of neglect and discrimination against them, especially when the legislation desired will not only benefit the farmers as a class, but will also, at the same time, bring untold benefits and happiness to all classes of our people.

The Free Rural Delivery System will no doubt be extended in the future. It can not be stated with absolute accuracy just how many people are served daily by the Rural Delivery Mail Service, but it is safe to say that it is well upward of 25,000,000.

The establishment of the Free Rural Mail Service was the first act of legislation by the Federal Government that was a direct benefit to the farmers as a class. That it has been of inestimable benefit can not be denied. This service has not only benefited the farmer but it has also at the same time benefited the whole country. It is a very useful and a very popular service. Any act of Congress that will tend to make more efficient this service or to extend its untold benefits will meet the hearty approval of the farmers of the country.

And, Mr. Chairman, any act of legislation here that will benefit the great agricultural classes of the United States will be a benefit to every other class of our people and to the whole country.

It is marvelous what free rural mail delivery has done for the rural districts of the United States. Although this great system has been established and developed largely within the last dozen years, its influence in the development and progress of the agricultural communities has been wonderful.

In many sections of the country it has completely changed country life.

To-day 45,000 rural mail carriers, in round numbers, are daily delivering to farmers of America at their front doors the great metropolitan daily newspapers, the best magazines and literary publications of the country, and first-class mail matter many times double in volume that received by them before the institution of this service.

The educational value of this service to the farming communities is incalculable. I remember very well in the country community where I was reared when but a single city newspaper came to the local post office. It was a weekly publication, and I can well remember how almost that entire neighborhood depended upon the substantial old farmer who enjoyed the luxury of a weekly newspaper for their information about current events.

A daily newspaper or a high-class magazine was a thing unknown in that community. That community was not any different from the average country community of that day.

That has not been so many years ago, and yet there has been a wonderful transformation in that neighborhood. Three rural mail routes now deliver mail to the citizens residing in that township. One of the carriers told me he delivered on his route alone 56 daily newspapers, several weekly and monthly publications, including church papers, farm journals, and magazines; that almost every one of his patrons took one of the local county papers, and many of them two or three. I have no doubt that

he also delivered daily more letters and first-class mail than the entire community received at the local post office in a week 15 years ago.

The change that has taken place in conditions in that community has taken place in the 45,000 other rural communities scattered throughout the length and breadth of these 48 States.

In addition to this we now have the parcel post, which has enhanced the value of this service manifold. The volume of business now transacted through the parcel post is enormous and is growing, and will continue to grow by leaps and bounds in the future. A very large per cent of all the parcel-post business is handled by the rural mail carriers. It is now a great source of revenue to the Government and will be greater as the years go by.

The installation of the free rural mail-delivery system on more than 1,000,000 miles of country roads certainly creates, on the part of the Government, a very vital interest in the question of roads, and also lays upon the Government the sacred duty of contributing at least its just and equitable part in improving and maintaining these roads.

The enactment of the present bill into law commits the Government to this policy. I submit, Mr. Chairman, it is a wise, a just, and a patriotic policy, one that necessarily follows the adoption of the policy of free rural mail delivery and a policy that will bring a greater measure of good to the whole country than any act of legislation in recent years.

It will certainly be an act of belated justice to our great farming population, who have contributed so much toward the development, the greatness, and the prosperity of the Republic.

I regret, Mr. Chairman, the position taken in opposition to this bill by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who is our colleague upon the Committee on Roads. The doctrine announced by him upon this floor, that in legislating upon great questions of national concern we are not to look beyond the borders of our own State to consider the general good of all the people of the Nation, is, to say the least, a strange doctrine to come out of the historic old State of Massachusetts.

It was a great son of this splendid Commonwealth who more than any other of our statesmen taught the American people to think in national terms. His clear and patriotic vision reached far beyond the boundaries of his much-beloved Massachusetts in considering questions of national import. His patriotic, prophetic, matchless words, "Liberty and union, one and inseparable, now and forever," uttered upon a memorable occasion have become the national watchword in Federal legislation and is the rock upon which those of us who support this and kindred measures base our argument in support of the proposition that the power and duty of Congress are commensurate with the requirements of the national welfare. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, there is no question of greater interest to the people of the United States, my State, and district than that of good roads, which is sufficient justification for my taking the time of the House for a few minutes. Everyone recognizes the importance of good roads. This question more nearly affects every citizen of the United States than perhaps any other bill pending or which may be introduced in this session of Congress.

In the first place, there are, in round numbers, about 6,500,000 farmers in the United States, according to the last census, and, including women and children, there are about 45,000,000 depending upon them. Everyone who owns a farm is deeply interested in this question, because a good road running by a farm, connecting it with a market or railroad station, greatly enhances the value of the land. The owner of the farm and those dependent upon him are not alone in being interested in this subject, but the tenants who live upon farms are also interested, because statistics show it costs 25 cents per ton per mile to transport farm products to market in the United States, while in continental Europe, where they have good roads, it costs but 8 cents per ton per mile, a loss to the farmer on account of bad roads of 17 cents per ton per mile.

I saw it stated in a newspaper not long ago that it costs a farmer more to haul a bushel of wheat 9½ miles from his farm to a railroad station, over the average road, such as we have in the United States, than it costs to ship a bushel of wheat from New York to Liverpool, a distance of 3,000 miles.

It is estimated that the railroads carry annually about 900,000,000 tons of freight and that at least 200,000,000 tons are hauled over the country roads to market, wharves, or railroad stations for shipment. It can be readily seen, therefore, what a

great loss the farmers of the country sustain by reason of bad roads throughout the country.

The Department of Agriculture is doing a great work in collecting data and publishing bulletins, inviting attention to the great economic value of good roads, educating the people throughout the country how to build them, and stimulating the farmers themselves to take greater interest in this movement for bettering the roads of the country.

There are in the United States about 2,250,000 miles of roads, and to improve them all is a gigantic task. We have to begin somewhere. It is true that it will take years to build them, but the building of good roads means more to the rural community than the time and money saved in transporting farm products to market. Good roads mean better schoolhouses, increased attendance at school, more "moonlight schools," and less illiteracy. [Applause.] They mean more churches and a larger attendance upon Sunday schools and church services; they mean combined country high schools.

Good roads make it possible to extend the Rural Mail Service to the door of every farmer throughout the United States, carrying the daily mail to him and enabling him to take daily papers, and bringing to him the same mail advantages enjoyed by those living in cities and towns.

Good roads by bringing these comforts and conveniences to the rural population will have a tendency to stop the farmer's boy and girl from desiring to remove to town, and will greatly stimulate the "back to the country movement." We who were reared upon the farm believe that this will greatly strengthen the citizenship of the United States.

The people who own the farms and make their living direct from farming are not alone in being interested in this subject, as laborers, carpenters, professional men, bankers, merchants, and, in fact, everyone who resides in cities and towns are also deeply interested in the question of good roads.

In my State of Oklahoma the merchants, bankers, and professional men take the lead in every good-road movement. They are always at the head of petitions for improving roads leading into the towns in which they live, subscribing money to buy material, and on road-working days close up their places of business to help build them. They appreciate that as the farmers are made more prosperous they have more money to pay bills, more money to buy clothing, more money to deposit in banks, and more money with which to build better houses and barns, which will require more lumber and hardware and the services of carpenters, and that they will invest more money in live stock. In other words, as they become more prosperous they will add to the general prosperity of the entire country. Hence in considering this question to-day our vision should be broader than looking at the question from a selfish standpoint, and we should appreciate the great importance that stimulating road building is to the entire citizenship of this Republic.

I have often thought that if the farmers of the country were educated to better farming and marketing methods, had the advantages of Rural Mail Service and good roads over which to transport their farm products to market, we could little dream of the wonderful prosperity that would come to them and the entire country within the next decade.

I am not on the committee which reported this bill, but no man in this House is in deeper sympathy with the question of good roads than I am. I have not the time now to critically analyze it. However, it provides that the building of good roads may be assisted by the Federal Government to the amount of not more than \$25,000,000 for any fiscal year, to be expended in the following manner:

Sixty-five thousand dollars to each State, and one-half of the remainder in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the population of all the States, and the other half in the ratio which the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes of each State bears to the total mileage of all the States.

I am not so sure that the bill is specific enough. Perhaps it should be more specific, but I want to say to the House that although this bill may not be the best bill that could be written, and it may be imperfect as to the details in some or many particulars, yet this or any other bill which has for its purpose aiding and stimulating the people in the building of good roads will have my unqualified support.

On January 12 I introduced a bill upon the same subject—H. R. 8819. It provides an appropriation of \$25,000,000 annually, divides the roads up into four classes, and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to expend a certain sum per mile upon each class of road.

There are three views with reference to road building in the United States: The first, I might say, is opposed to any

Government aid whatsoever; the second wants great highways built across the country connecting capitals, important cities and towns; and the third class, to which I belong, believes that the money should be used to aid and stimulate the farmers of the country to appreciate the importance and necessity of building good roads from the farms to the markets.

The bill which I drew gave every civil subdivision in each State of the United States the option of using a pro rata part of the money appropriated by the Federal Government.

The bill under consideration, as I construe it, leaves this question to the State highway commissioner of each State. I think it ought to be so written in the law that no favoritism whatever could be shown, either by the Federal or State authorities, against the weaker citizens of this country.

What I would like to guard against is making it possible for any State authority to discriminate in favor of the larger highways and against the less influential citizens of the country.

The bill introduced by me contains a provision giving each civil subdivision the right to its share of the money, conditioned that at least an equal amount should be made available for the same purpose, and that in the event any civil subdivision did not avail itself of the money to which it was entitled, then the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to expend all of the money to which said civil subdivision of any State was entitled upon the larger highways of that State, if the subdivisions through which said highways ran should make an equal amount of money available for the same purpose.

In the bill under consideration the State of Oklahoma will receive \$532,138 if it becomes a law. It would receive about an equal sum under the terms of the bill introduced by me.

I am glad to know that doubt no longer exists as to the constitutional power of the General Government to lend its financial aid in the construction and maintenance of good roads.

While, of course, I would not do violence to the Constitution of my country, but if its constitutionality had not already been tested, and I entertained a reasonable doubt about it, I would resolve that doubt in favor of the bill and permit the Supreme Court to finally pass upon the question.

The State of Oklahoma, anticipating that this or similar legislation might be enacted by Congress, on March 15, 1915, passed a comprehensive road law creating a department of highways and providing for the appointment of a commissioner of highways and defining his duties in detail. Among his other duties it is provided that he should—

Fifth. To cooperate with the Federal Government in all matters pertaining to the improvement of public highways, and all funds provided by Congress and appropriated for the improvement of the public highways in this State shall be expended under the supervision of the commissioner of highways.

It authorizes the commissioner of highways to appoint a State engineer—

Who shall be a civil engineer of established reputation and qualified in road and bridge construction.

It also provides for the appointment of county engineers, and requires that they shall have a practical knowledge of civil engineering and of road building, and that no person shall be elected or appointed to this position who does not hold a certificate from the State highway commissioner or who has not stood the examination required by his department.

The act is a very comprehensive one, providing for cooperation between the State highway commissioner, the county engineers, and the county commissioners, and for designating, laying out, and the platting of a complete system of roads in every county throughout the State. It also provides a means of State and county taxation of one-fourth of 1 mill ad valorem, as well as a tax of 50 cents per horsepower on each automobile.

I cite this to show that our new State is alive to the great importance of this question and will gladly welcome the enactment of this legislation by Congress.

Oklahoma is peculiarly interested in this legislation, because of the fact that the eastern half of the State was formerly occupied by the Five Civilized Tribes, and when these tribal lands were allotted a large part of them were made nontaxable either by agreement or by acts of Congress.

But this bill, Mr. Chairman, has more in it than the financial assistance we extend to farmers and more than stimulating the farmers in good road building; it will do more than give better school facilities, more than increase the attendance upon Sunday schools and churches, and greatly improve the Rural Mail Service. Over and above all it will restore confidence to the farmers of this country and bring them to realize that their Representatives in Congress have their welfare at heart, and that while the farmers of the country bear so much of the burdens of this Government in the way of taxation, Congress is ready and willing to give them recognition and to give them some of the benefits of this Government. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest that when I heard the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] talking about the Cumberland Road and then gritting his teeth and opposing this bill because it was unconstitutional, I remembered when that road was being built. Thomas Jefferson was President of the United States and a man by the name of Hodge was attorney general in Pennsylvania, and Pennsylvania undertook to dictate where the road should go or veto its right to go through the State. And Thomas Jefferson sent a message saying he was willing to recognize counsel of Pennsylvania as to where it should go, but the right to go through every State and any State was a governmental right that he would not yield. So if there was nothing else in the Constitution on this road question, I would much rather risk Thomas Jefferson than the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GORDON. I would like to say that every State through which that road passed gave its consent.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Sure. It had to, because Thomas Jefferson notified them it was going on, anyhow. And so the question of constitutionality is lodged upon the proposition that the Constitution says Congress shall have power to establish post offices and post roads. That word "establish" has been construed in divers decisions to give Congress the right to build roads, build post offices, buy mail sacks, make contracts, and ten thousand—yea, a million—other things, under the one word "establish." And we build thousands of post offices all over this Republic under that one word "establish." And the same word "establish" that gives the right to build a post office gives the right to build post roads—governs both in the same proposition.

Then the next point of constitutionality is founded upon the fact that they say it is under the general-welfare clause. I have never been a stickler for the general-welfare clause, but I can find thousands of very munificent and splendid institutions in this Republic that had no other method of getting in. For instance, I challenge the gentleman, who is such a stickler for constitutionality, to find me one sentence in the Constitution that authorizes Cincinnati to have a national bank. I challenge any man to do it. And in the constitutional convention, when the power to create a corporation was up for discussion, they voted it down three times, and Mr. Morris of Pennsylvania said the reason they voted it down was because they were afraid somebody would establish a bank.

But I am going to get back to my friend from New York [Mr. MAGEE]. He is gone. I wanted to say something. I was amused when that exuberant, volatile, good-looking fellow got through with his speech. I really was. He looked over to our side of the House and said he did not consider that the whole ballasting power that held the ship of state properly poised was on that side of the House. And I agreed with him. And I decided that I would watch hereafter, and if it takes a massive, ponderous brain to balance the ship of state we will have to keep our side pretty well filled up to hold his side level. He wound up by saying that he was not opposing this matter so much on its merits, but was wanting to save the whole financial appropriation business to put into a lot of big gunboats and an imperial standing Army.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TILLMAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TILLMAN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Chairman, this seems to be quite a field day for the freshmen. Quite a number of new Members are plunging in this afternoon, and it is well enough to give them an opportunity to be heard.

I was somewhat disappointed by the speech of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE]. I speak with respect of him and of his great State. But the doctrine which he enunciated if applied to the South would be considered by us an unfortunate one, and would be considered by many citizens of New York as an unfortunate doctrine. The gentleman used the expression that New York ought not to be mulcted in the sum of \$3,000,000 for the purpose of building up highways thousands of miles from New York. If we applied that doctrine to Arkansas, to the Southern States, where the negro population is large, we would be criticized by the gentleman from New York, and properly so. Down in our country, down in the South, the negroes unfortunately pay but little tax, pay but a small school tax; and yet, whenever an effort is made by a

southern legislator to segregate the taxes paid by the white people for the benefit of white schools only, Democratic legislatures always vote such measures down overwhelmingly.

You ought not to despise States because they are small or because they are poor. The starry heavens are more beautiful because the little stars shine there along with the big stars, and no one would want to blot out a star because, though it is bright, it is small, and because there are larger and more brilliant constellations.

New York has received much at the hands of the Federal Government, as have other States whose Representatives criticize this measure. Millions of dollars have been expended all over the country by pouring into streams that are dry half the year millions of dollars and by pouring millions of dollars into harbors that are never whitened by the sail of a ship or blackened by the smoke of a steamer; and now, when the country asks for a meager appropriation for good roads for the purpose of building up the whole country, we find gentlemen in the larger States, where millions of Federal money have been wasted as above stated, raising the question that they ought not to be required to spend more money than can be used in their own bailiwicks or in their own sections.

This is by far the most important bill that has been considered by this Congress, or that will be considered by the present Congress. More people are interested in this measure and more people desire its speedy passage. My only objection to this bill is that it does not go far enough.

I introduced a road bill, H. R. 479, on the first day of the session that was considered too radical by the committee, perhaps, asking for \$1,000,000 for each State annually until \$1,000,000,000 should be consumed in road building. Such a measure as that would furnish employment for the unemployed and would bring happiness and prosperity to all the people. I know of nothing so important to the country as the bill I had the honor to introduce. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to be allowed to insert the bill in the RECORD. It is not lengthy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to insert the bill named by him in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the bill referred to:

A bill (H. R. 479) to provide for Federal aid to good roads, to aid the States in maintenance of roads, and to create a national highway commission.

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to establish, improve, and maintain public roads that are now or may hereafter be needed for use as post roads, military roads, or for interstate commerce, there be, and hereby is, created a fund to be known as the United States highway fund. Said fund shall be raised in the manner herein provided, but the Treasurer of the United States is hereby authorized to receive and place to the credit of said fund any money that may be contributed from other sources and to expend the same upon the order of the United States highway commission or in accordance with the conditions of the contribution.

Sec. 2. That for the purpose of providing money for the United States highway fund the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to issue and sell on and after January 1, 1918, at par, with accrued interest, coupon or registered bonds of the United States in such form as he may prescribe, in denominations of \$20, or multiples of that sum, said bonds to be payable in coin 50 years from the date of issue and to bear interest payable in coin semiannually at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, the total amount of said bonds not to exceed \$1,000,000,000, and the issue and sale of same not to exceed such amounts as may be necessary from time to time to enable the Treasurer of the United States to make payments of salaries of officers, agents, engineers, and employees, and for expenditures in the preliminary work and in the work of laying out, construction, repairs, and maintenance of the highways to be built under the provisions of this act. Bonds issued under the authority of this act, or the income therefrom, shall not be subject to taxation of any kind for any purpose. Bonds authorized by this section shall be first offered at par as a popular loan under such regulations, prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, as will give opportunity to the citizens of the United States to participate in the subscriptions to such loans, and in allotting such bonds the several subscriptions of individuals shall be first accepted, and the subscriptions for the lowest amounts shall be first allotted. Any portion of any issue of said bonds not subscribed for as above provided may be disposed of by the Secretary of the Treasury at not less than par, under such regulations as he may prescribe, but no commissions shall be allowed or paid thereon; and a sum not exceeding one-twentieth of 1 per cent of the amount of the bonds herein authorized is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to pay the expense of preparing, advertising, and issuing the same.

Sec. 3. That as soon as practicable after January 1, 1918, the sum of \$1,000,000 shall be expended annually in each State under the direction of the United States highway commission, hereinafter constituted, without regard to population, taxable property, or extent of territory in said States, in the construction, maintenance, and extension of public roads as before mentioned and for the purposes before mentioned, and such construction, maintenance, and extension shall be continued until the fund above provided for shall be exhausted.

Sec. 4. That there is hereby created a United States highway commission, to carry out the provisions of this act, to be composed of competent experts in road building, four of whom shall be selected by the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and three members from each State to be appointed by the governor and confirmed by the highest legislative body of said State,

the first four members acting with the last-mentioned members to constitute the United States highway commission for the different States respectively. Each of the first four named commissioners shall receive as salary the sum of \$10,000 annually, and the last-named commissioners to receive \$5,000 annually, each commissioner to receive his necessary expenses when traveling in the performance of his duty as such commissioner. Members of the commission shall give bond for the faithful performance of their duties in whatever sum the Secretary of the Treasury shall require.

Sec. 5. The four members of the United States highway commission first mentioned in this act shall have power to make all needful rules for the proper administration of this act, the payment of salaries, expenses, for materials, labor, and the safeguarding of all funds under its control, and shall be empowered to employ and fix the salaries of all clerks, engineers, and employees.

Sec. 6. Said commission shall have its head office in the District of Columbia, but shall maintain one public highway division in and for each State where the local members of said commission shall have their offices. Said commission may require the assistance and cooperation of the officers and employees of any department in its work.

Sec. 7. That before any State shall receive the benefits of this act, the legislature of said State shall assent to the provisions of this act by resolution duly passed and approved by governor of the State.

Sec. 8. That said highway commission shall, as far as practicable, construct the roads contemplated in this act so as to serve and benefit the people of each State fairly and equitably and without unjust discrimination, and said work shall be carried on in each State simultaneously.

Sec. 9. That this act shall be in force from and after its passage.

Mr. TILLMAN. I prefer my own bill to any other, but I am willing and anxious to vote for the pending bill or for any other bill that proposes to build up the great highways of the country. I prefer good roads to giant navies or to mighty armies.

Mr. Chairman, the dirt road is used by the farmer a hundred times where the railroad is used by him once. As was stated here by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS], all the great nations of the world have been road builders. The greater the nation, the greater road builder it has been, and these roads have been built by public moneys; by moneys taken out of the national treasury.

Highways range from the narrow path made by the savage to the graded turnpike. Highway history is both interesting and instructive. The Athenian senate bestowed much care upon good roads. The Carthaginians were good road builders. In Peru the Incas built lasting highways, the remains of which attest their magnificence and advanced civilization. The road from Quito to Cuzco, in Peru, was 2,000 miles in length, 20 feet wide, paved with stones 10 feet square, and had a running stream and shade trees on each side. The great highway leading from Babylon to ancient Memphis was paved at an early date, and along this road rose the cities of Nineveh, Tyre, Damascus, and Antioch.

In 312 B. C. Appius Claudius, a Roman patrician, became censor of the Roman Commonwealth and gained enduring fame by beginning, in 313, the construction of a remarkable road, which was named the Appian Way. It has been called the "queen of highways." The width of this road varied from 15 to 18 feet, and the method of construction was as follows: A trench was excavated the entire length and breadth of the roadway. In the trench the road materials were placed in four layers, having a thickness of 3 feet. The first layer consisted of large flat stones laid in lime mortar. The second was composed of broken stone mixed with one-third their quantity of lime, packed and made solid by ramming. The third layer was made of a mixture of broken brick, tiles, gravel, and lime, and the top pavement was a layer of regularly shaped stones about 6 inches thick, closely jointed and fitted with the utmost nicety. This road was eminently durable, but the poet Horace, who wrote concerning it, states that it was fatiguing to travel over it slowly. This road led direct from the gates of Rome to Capua, and was finally extended to Brundisium, 350 miles from the imperial city. It commands a beautiful prospect, embracing Campania, while on both sides of this great highway are numerous tombs, among which are the tombs of the Scipios.

The greatest of the Cæsars, the princely Julius, traveled over this "queen of roads," as did Cæsar Augustus and the war-lord Trajan, as did Marcus Brutus and the golden-lipped Cicero, as did the fascinating Cleopatra and the soldier-orator Marc Antony, and the greatest man of the ancient world, St. Paul himself, traveled with bare feet along this same Appian Way when he visited the wonderful city of the Cæsars.

To-day this durable road, long after the death of the blue-blooded Claudius, is in good repair, and now the swift and noiseless motor car glides gracefully over its dustless surface, pressing the same stones that felt the martial tread of great Pompey's legions more than 20 centuries ago. Rome built many other highways and became great by the help of these roads, which were built with money taken from the public treasury. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] is recognized.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to make any elaborate speech on this bill; in fact, I could not do so within the time allotted me by the chairman of the committee. Its merits are so manifest, however, that it furnishes its own defense. I do not think that there will be a more important—perhaps I should modify that by saying a more meritorious—bill come before this Congress than the one that we are now considering. I want to see this bill passed, and I hope that the Committee on Appropriations, after it is passed, will see its way clear to bring in a bill appropriating the amount of money authorized by this bill and that the good work will start. It does not take a student of affairs to see that the question of improved highways is one of ever-growing importance. A study of the historical feature of this interesting subject is not without its value in this connection, and in reading data on the subject in the Library of Congress I find:

HISTORICAL DATA.

The first American road law was passed by the General Assembly of Virginia in 1632, and the first American road built by white men was at Jamestown a few years later; in New England the path between Boston and Plymouth was begun in 1639; in the province of New York laws for road building were passed in 1664; two years later the first Maryland road law came into existence; and Pennsylvania followed in 1692 with a road act, placing the control of highways in the hands of townships, and this State is credited with the first important macadam road built in America—the Lancaster Turnpike, from Lancaster to Philadelphia—which was constructed in 1794.

The earliest authentic record of permanent roads is found in Egypt. A little to the east of the great Pyramids were discovered the remains of the giant causeway more than a mile in length. This is supposed to be a portion of the great highway built by King Cheops for the purpose of affording a passage across the sand for the transportation of the stone used in the construction of the great Pyramids. This is doubtless the road on which Herodotus tells us the great king employed 100,000 men for a period of 10 years. It was built of massive stone blocks 10 feet thick and was skirted on each side with mausoleums, temples, porticos, and statues.

The Persians probably learned the art of road building from the Babylonians, who built the first stone bridges and constructed a system of military roads throughout their Empire. There were two branches of a great road leading from Babylon to Syria, and historians say that a moderate toll was exacted.

The Romans were the first systematic road builders of the world. The first of their great roads was constructed from Rome to Capua, a distance of 142 Italian miles, by Claudius Appian, about 312 B. C., and is known as the Appian Way, or "The Queen of the Roads." This road was later extended to Brundisium, about 360 miles, and was probably completed by Julius Caesar. About 220 B. C. the Flaminian Way was built. This road is of great interest because of its stone arch bridge across the River Nar, 60 miles from Rome. The central arch had a span of 150 feet and a rise of 100 feet, and has been pronounced the stateliest ruin in Italy. After the completion of the Flaminian Way, road building progressed rapidly until Rome reached the height of her glory, when there were 29 great military roads centering in the city. They represented the visible efforts of a nation for the preservation and extension of her national glory. The majority of the main Roman highways were built by contract at public expense. They were maintained in part by labor of soldiers and convicts or slaves, or by enforced service, which, in some instances, took the form of taxation. The supervision of the roads was intrusted to men of the highest rank. Augustus himself seems to have made those about Rome his special care. Crossroads were placed in charge of the local magistrates, although occasionally portions of the road were assigned to some landowner to maintain at his own cost.

The present road system of France, which is perhaps the finest in the world, was founded by Napoleon. He built many roads through the Empire, among them the road over the Simplon Pass, which was commenced in 1800 and required six years for completion. It was under him that the work was systematized and placed in the hands of a permanent body of engineers. In 1775 Tresaguet, a French engineer, published a

treatise on broken-stone roads. His work preceded that of Macadam and Telford by about 40 years.

The first record of road legislation in England goes back as far as 1285, and it provides that the trees and bushes on both sides of all roads for a distance of 200 feet shall be cut away to prevent robbers from lurking therein and rushing upon victims unawares. In 1346 Edward III authorized the first toll to be levied for the repair of roads. This commission was granted to the master of the Hospital of St. Giles and to John Holborn, authorizing them to levy toll on vehicles passing on the roads leading from the hospital to the old Temple of London, and also on an adjoining road called the Portal. In 1523 Parliament passed its first act relative to the repair of roads; but it was not until the middle of the eighteenth century that highway legislation became active.

RECENT ACTIVITY.

This activity has grown with the passing years, and more so in recent years than ever before. In fact, nearly every State of the Union is actively aroused to the need of good roads and is making large expenditures for that purpose, either in the way of State appropriation or by means of local taxation. A study of the figures for the year ending December 31, 1914, will clearly display this activity. For the whole United States there was expended for the year 1914, by State funds, local funds, and joint funds, the total sum of \$249,055,067. Every State in the Union was engaged in some degree in this good work. Some of the larger expenditures were: New York, \$29,890,473; California, \$14,670,614; Indiana, \$13,258,761; Iowa, \$11,437,000; Ohio, \$11,261,882; Pennsylvania, \$10,424,580; Michigan, \$9,516,224; Wisconsin, \$9,118,708; Texas, \$8,750,000; and so on down the line, every State being actively alive to the importance of improved highways.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, as I have said, there has never been a time in American history when our people have been so keenly sensible to the importance of this internal improvement than to-day, and I think we have reached that point where the Federal Government should lend its aid; not in any sense to relieve the States and their localities of their duty and responsibility in the matter, but to supplement their good work by cooperation and intelligent assistance.

Section 8 of Article I of the Federal Constitution provides that Congress, among other things, shall have the power to "establish post offices and post roads"; and it is, therefore, not only within the power of the National Government to do so, but it is its manifest duty to do it.

NATIONAL AID.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Party in its platform at Baltimore in 1912 had the following to say on this important question:

We favor national aid to State and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post roads.

And the Progressive Party in its platform adopted at Chicago June, 1912, said:

We recognize the vital importance of good roads and we pledge our party to foster their extension in every proper way, and we favor the early construction of national highways.

And the Socialist Party in their national convention in 1912 went on record in specific terms as favoring national aid to the development of highways and waterways system.

But the Republican platform, so far as I have been able to find, was silent on this important question; and no wonder that it fell from an electoral vote of 321 in 1908 to an electoral vote of 8 in 1912—Vermont and Utah, I believe. But I am glad to note that there are many Republicans in this House who, despite their training to the contrary, know a good thing when they see it and will vote for this bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who has filed a minority report on this bill, seems to think that this is a bill designed to help certain sections of the country at the expense of the others. Why, Mr. Chairman, nothing could be further from the truth. I know of no measure that could possibly pass this House that would be of more general benefit to the entire country than the one that we now have under consideration. A comprehensive system of public highways will add more to the wealth of the United States and the prosperity and happiness of its people than any other improvement of which I can conceive, and it is unworthy of the gentleman from Massachusetts to say that it is a sectional matter and ought not to be passed.

Now I read from the minority report which he has filed the following excerpt:

The States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Ohio, and Pennsylvania will pay into the Federal Treasury the larger proportion of the sum appropriated in this measure, and will receive in some cases less than one-quarter the amount paid in, while other

States will receive relatively twice as much as they contribute to the Federal Treasury.

Now, what does that argument of the gentleman mean in its final analysis? It simply means that when this Congress goes to appropriate money to carry on this Government that it must be careful to see that each State receives as much money as it pays into the Public Treasury. How does the gentleman from Massachusetts think that rule would work as to rivers and harbors, public buildings and grounds, pensions, Army and Navy expenditures, appropriation for the Post Office Department, and all the other activities of the Federal Government? Under such a rule as that I am sure that the gentleman would concede that we Representatives from the Southern States would have a grievance. But there is no such rule, never has been, and could not be in the orderly conduct of the affairs of this Government. Now, let us apply the gentleman's standard of measure which he prescribes to the matter of pensions, for instance, and see how it works out. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, the report of the Commissioner of Pensions shows that the sum of \$171,337,455.61 was paid out of the Treasury of the United States for pensions, and of this amount the six States which the gentleman mentions in his minority report, viz, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, received a total of \$60,200,566.36, or a little more than 35 per cent of the whole fund. Does the gentleman think that the other 42 States of this Union should oppose pensions in worthy cases merely because 35 cents out of every dollar appropriated for that purpose goes to the six States which he has named? Why, of course, he does not. He would reply at once that the reason that these six States get so large a portion of the pension money is because they have the pensioners who are entitled to receive it.

And so I say, in regard to this bill, the reason that some States will get more money, relatively, than others is because they have more population, more mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes, all of which are used as a basis of consideration in this bill and are just and equitable. The bill does not provide for any particular amount for any particular State, except the \$65,000 that is arbitrarily given to each State regardless of its size and population, and then the balance that it will receive will depend entirely upon its population, together with mileage of rural routes and star mail routes. Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts mentioned the State of Delaware in his remarks on this bill, for the purpose of comparison—that State of which ex-Senator John J. Ingalls, I believe, once said "had three counties at low tide and two at high tide." Now, I have not anything against the State of Delaware; it is all right. It has one Representative in Congress—Mr. MILLER—and I think he is a fine young man, and I like him and hope he will vote for this bill. He ought to, because he will find that Delaware fares all right under this bill.

Let us see how Delaware fares under this bill. If it becomes a law, Delaware will receive \$103,290, and I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that Delaware had a total mileage of 3,000 miles of public roads within her borders on January 1, 1915. Figuring, then, from a mileage standpoint of public roads, Delaware would receive \$34.43 for every mile of public road within her borders. Now, let us see how my own State of Texas fares under the bill in this respect. Under the bill it is estimated that Texas will receive the sum of \$1,070,386. On January 1, 1915, the State of Texas had 128,971 miles of public roads; therefore we would receive under this bill \$8.30 for each mile of public road that we have in Texas.

In other words, the State of Delaware, which the gentleman used as an illustration to fortify his complaint, receives \$34.43 for each mile of public road that it has and Texas only receives \$8.30 for each mile of public road that it has. Suppose we take the gentleman's own State of Massachusetts. Massachusetts will receive under the provisions of this bill \$535,420. On January 1, 1915, the State of Massachusetts had within its borders 17,272 miles of public road, and would therefore receive \$31 for every mile of public road they have, against \$8.30 per mile for Texas. And take, if you please, the State of the chairman of this committee, Hon. DORSEY W. SHACKLEFORD. Certainly if the committee had wanted to favor any State it would not have overlooked the chairman of the Roads Committee of this House. Under the terms of this bill it is estimated that the State of Missouri will receive the sum of \$974,114. On January 1, 1915, the State of Missouri had 120,000 miles of public roads, and therefore will only receive \$8.12 for each mile of public road that she has within her borders, as against the figures heretofore given as to Delaware and Massachusetts. And going further, let us take, if you please, the other five States to which the gentleman referred: Connecticut would receive \$20.56; New York, \$19.90; New Jersey, \$29.50; Ohio, \$14.82; and Pennsylvania, \$16.70 for every mile of public road which they have

within their borders. The general average for the six States which the gentleman names would be about \$22 per mile, whereas the general average for the 48 States as a whole is, in round numbers, \$11 for each mile of public road in the United States.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman ought to congratulate himself that these States have fared so well. If the committee had framed this bill so that the amount available for each State would have depended upon its mileage of public roads, then the States mentioned by the gentleman would not have fared so well and he might have had cause for complaint. But the bill is not framed that way. It first apportions \$65,000 to each State irrespective of size and population, and then apportions the balance according to population and rural-route and star-route mileage; and so, instead of complaining at the bill on that score, the gentleman from Massachusetts should be shaking hands with himself that the States in which he seems so much interested have fared so well.

Now, the gentleman named Texas as one of the States which did not appropriate anything directly for the aid of public roads last year, and, strictly speaking, I think the gentleman is correct, for we have as yet no State highway commission. But it would perhaps not be out of place to say that in 1914 the various localities of Texas spent \$8,750,000 in building roads, which was only exceeded by eight of the other States of the Union, viz, Colorado, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin; and we to-day have nearly 1,000 miles more of hard-surfaced roads than the State of Massachusetts. But, of course, we have a much larger State and we need many more miles of hard-surfaced roads yet, and will surely get them as time rolls on.

THIS BILL WILL NOT HINDER STATE AND LOCAL ACTIVITY BUT WILL ENCOURAGE AND HELP.

Now, another phase of this matter which I desire to notice for a moment is the inquiry propounded by my colleague from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. The inquiry was this:

Does not the gentleman think that if the appropriation is once made out of the Federal Treasury for the construction of highways, it will absolutely paralyze all local movement and that no community will ever thereafter be willing to do anything for itself?

The gentleman from Massachusetts made quick reply to this inquiry by stating that he thought it would have such effect. Now, it seems to me that that is a far-fetched conclusion and not supported by any process of logic or reasoning. In my opinion, if no other results followed the appropriation of \$25,000,000 authorized by this bill than the stimulus that it would give to the improvement and development of postal highways all over the United States, it would be the best \$25,000,000 that this Government has spent in many a day. The time has come, Mr. Chairman, when one of the most serious problems that exists in our social and economic life, is the crowding of our people into the cities and the complex problems of poverty and unemployment that so naturally follow this condition. Why, sir, in 1790 only 3.35 per cent of our people lived in the cities; 30 years later, in 1820, only 4.93 per cent of our population lived in cities; 30 years later than this, in 1850, the percentage had increased to 12.49 per cent; and still 30 years later, in 1880, the percentage had grown to 22.57 per cent, and to-day more than 40 per cent of the entire population of the United States live in cities of more than 2,500 inhabitants.

Is it any wonder that the cost of living is mounting higher and higher? It is bound to do so so long as our consuming class increases so out of proportion to the producing class. Why, if this condition of affairs is not remedied by wise foresight and prompt action and is allowed to go on as it now is—

The lamb that followed Mary
Will no longer be seen around,
For she'll sell the little critter
At 20 cents a pound.

What are we going to do about it? I contend that the best remedy in the world is to build good roads, improved school facilities, an efficient and sufficient system of rural credits—such as I believe this Congress is going to pass—and encourage our people back to the farm and make farm life agreeable and desirable.

THIS BILL IS NOT CLASS LEGISLATION.

But the gentleman said yesterday that this would be class legislation because forsooth it would benefit the farmers in a more direct way than any other class. Indeed, that is a strange argument to use in a body possessing the collective intelligence of the United States Congress. Does the gentleman think that the money appropriated for the improvement of our great harbors is class legislation, because perchance it will more directly benefit the ships that sail the seas? Does he think that the great Federal reserve act, that will surely prove a safe anchor

in every time of financial storm, is class legislation because it operates through our banking system and does not overturn it? In fact, did the gentleman think at all when he said that this was a piece of class legislation? This is a strange statement to come from a Member possessing the intelligence of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have found that reckless statements are sometimes made in this House. I heard the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], on Thursday of this week, while speaking during consideration of the urgent deficiency bill, indulge in about 40 minutes' verbal exercise criticizing the President of the United States for his dealing with the Mexican problem, and in to-day's Washington Post I notice an extract from a speech delivered by a distinguished private citizen of the United States, ex-President Roosevelt, at Philadelphia one day this week, in which he says:

Individuals and nations who preach the doctrine of milk and water invariably have in them a softness of fiber which means that they fear to antagonize those who preach the doctrine of blood and iron.

Indeed, that is a fine-sounding phrase to be uttered by an ex-President of the United States. Indeed, one would be led to think from remarks like these that we are a Nation of cowards. Now, it is my good fortune to be a Representative in Congress from Texas, and I hope I may be permitted to say that Texans are neither afraid to fight nor too proud to fight. The State that gave to history the story of San Jacinto and the Alamo is not of the milk and water variety, but Texas does not want any war with Mexico or any other country. We want peace. And we hope that President Wilson will continue in the future to disregard the jingoes as he has in the past and continue to exercise the patience, judgment, and forbearance that has thus far led us safely into paths of peace. Every patriotic American citizen should be giving him his sympathetic cooperation instead of hurling at him a lot of harangue that means nothing and possesses less than no merit at all. Such intemperate utterances as some of these we are hearing now remind me of an anecdote that the late ex-Gov. Bob Taylor used to tell in one of his lectures when referring to these fellows who are always spoiling for a fight. He said that back in Tennessee they had on trial a negro who had posed as a "bully" among the members of his race and that the prosecuting attorney brought in an old negro servant who lived in the community to testify as to this "bad nigger's" character.

When the old negro was asked as to "Bill's" reputation for being a fussy, quarrelsome, and dangerous "nigger," he said, "Well, boss, Bill is very vivid in verbal exercise and is powerful active in his linguistics, but," said he, "when it comes to personal adjustment he is not so eager for de context." Well, now, my friends, when it comes to verbal exercise and activity in their linguistics, some of these gentlemen who are so viciously attacking the President are very proficient, but if it should come to a matter of personal adjustment, I do not know that they would make any greater rush for the front than any of the rest of us.

But I hope, Mr. Chairman, that I will be pardoned for having made this digression at this point, and will now return to a further discussion of the bill which we are considering. When I digressed I was discussing the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], to the effect that this good-roads bill was a matter of class legislation. I have never had any of that disposition to array the city against the country or the country against the city. "A man's a man for a' that," whether he lives in the city or the country. "But there is neither east nor west, border nor breed, nor birth, when two strong men stand face to face, though they come from the ends of the earth." Just as one stone laid well upon the other makes the massive structure when completed, with all of its symmetry and proportion, just so does the citizenship of the city and the citizenship of the country blend together and make our Commonwealth what it is to-day; and any legislation that contributes to the progress and welfare of our rural communities is bound to benefit the city, and it is idle to talk about it being class legislation.

CONCLUSION.

And now, Mr. Chairman, in closing I wish to express the hope that the pledge of the Democratic Party made at Baltimore, to extend national aid to the States in the construction and maintenance of good roads, will be redeemed by this bill becoming a law. And if it does become a law, it will take its place alongside the other notable constructive legislation of this Democratic administration, and we will go before the country in 1916 with a record of achievement unsurpassed in the political annals of the United States. We will have accomplished things and not merely talked about them. And, Mr. Chairman, I have

no fears but that a grateful and appreciative people will reciprocate by giving their unreserved indorsement at the polls.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I will ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNN] to use some of his time.

Mr. DUNN. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a good deal of attention to the arguments advanced by those who favor this bill, and likewise to the very splendid address of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and others in opposition thereto. It is apparent that a favorable sentiment exists in this House toward this measure, and this fact, in connection with the almost unanimous recommendation of the committee, indicates that the bill will pass. Notwithstanding these facts, I take my stand with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and others in opposition to the bill.

During my brief experience in this Hall I have been impressed with the continuous and insistent demand for selfish legislation. The cry for increased paternalism is most persistent. No one who is advocating the passage of this bill will pretend that the advantages by way of increased commercial facilities to those who will be obliged to pay the bulk of the taxes will be in any manner commensurate to the benefits of those who live in the neighborhoods where the improvements are made. It is a proposal, under whatever name you put it, to tax the people who in many cases have already burdened themselves for improvement in their own localities to build roads for others in localities where the people will not pay the expense of their own improvements. You are asking that the people who do not have the advantages of good roads, either from neglect or inability to provide them, be given improved roads at the expense of localities already burdened in many cases with heavy bond issues for their own local improvements. In the county which I have the honor in part to represent we have issued road bonds which remain unpaid to the amount of \$12,250,000, and in addition to this sum for the freeing of toll bridges additional bonds amounting to \$5,200,000, making in all \$17,450,000 which was done as much for the farmers in our community as for any other class of people. And now you propose to lay additional burdens upon us to build roads for those who will not pay the expense of their own road building.

You say that the communities in which you are interested are not able to pay for extensive road improvements. Even so, ought you to ask others to do that work for you? Remember that the older communities have passed through the same conditions through which the newer ones are now passing. Remember that increased population brings with it increased burdens, and in the natural order of things there is a sort of equalization, as the larger communities must pay extra taxes in order to make the necessary improvements to accommodate the larger number of people. That is the reason why France and other countries with dense population have the better roads. It is in the natural order of development.

In this debate much concern is shown for the farmer. Now, we are all interested in the welfare of the farmer, just as we are interested in the welfare of every other class of the American people; but I do not think it out of place to suggest to you that the National Government in recent years has done much, and perhaps more for the farmer than for any other class of our people. [Applause.] Look over the increased expenditures of the governmental departments during the past 10 years, and you will find that the Agricultural Department has increased its expenditures 250 per cent, largely in the interest of the American farmer. It was surely considered a great boon when the Rural Delivery Service was extended for the benefit of the farmer, and Uncle Sam carried the farmer's mail over the farmer's own muddy roads to his door, and instead of receiving the thanks of the farmer for tramping through the mire, Uncle Sam is now asked to build improved roads in order to keep his feet clean.

But while we are discussing the farmer let me call your attention to the fact that there are a respectable number of these honored gentlemen in the Eastern States who have given of their means to build roads in their own neighborhoods, and you have no right to ask them now to give further of their means to build roads in localities hundreds of miles away. As I have already stated, you propose to lay additional burdens of taxation for road improvements on those who have done their duty for the benefit of people who in the exercise of their rights of local self-government have refused to tax themselves, and now want to tax other people to do what they refuse to do for themselves.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN. I will.

Mr. FIELDS. Does the gentleman believe that the harbors of our country should be maintained by the Federal Government or by the citizens along the coast?

Mr. COLEMAN. I believe that they should be constructed by the Federal Government, because they are controlled by the Federal Government, as every Federal improvement should be controlled, and not for the benefit of any local community.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLEMAN. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. Does the gentleman contend that the only benefit derived from roads is the benefit derived by the people who live immediately upon the roads?

Mr. COLEMAN. That is not the only benefit.

Mr. FIELDS. If the gentleman did believe that, would it not be a proper argument to apply to the ports and harbors of our country?

Mr. COLEMAN. No.

Mr. FIELDS. I suppose the gentleman must live near one of the harbors of our country?

Mr. COLEMAN. No; I do not live particularly close. I live over in the western part of Pennsylvania, and we are not particularly close to a harbor.

But, gentlemen, this attempt to further tax people who have already taxed themselves in the performance of a local duty is most unjust. You may argue that the distribution you propose is an equitable one, but the facts will not sustain you. Let me call your attention to the inequality of the tax you propose levying upon the people. The total amount of taxes raised from internal revenue during the fiscal year of 1915 was over \$415,000,000, made up as follows: Ordinary, \$335,000,000; corporation income, \$39,000,000; and individual income, \$41,000,000. Of this total of \$415,000,000, the States of California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, 8 in all out of the 48, paid \$249,000,000, or approximately five-eighths. And of the corporation-income tax the same States paid two-thirds and of the individual-income tax three-fourths of the whole. After taxing them thus heavily you propose by this bill to levy an additional burden, and out of the extra tax raised, of which these States will pay approximately five-eighths of the whole, you will give back to them \$8,000,000, or less than one-third. That I say is most inequitable and unjust.

Is it any wonder that Democratic papers like the New York World should say:

This is potentially the fattest pork barrel ever rolled on the floor of Congress for an emptying among hungry patriots and bucolic statesmen.

Is it to be wondered at when the Fort Worth Recorder, a Democratic paper down there in the home of the gentleman from Texas, should say:

A Federal appropriation for roads under the circumstances is a pure gratuity to the State, for which Congress has no moral right to collect revenue and no legal right according to the honest intent of the Constitution.

I do not wish you to understand that I desire to raise a constitutional question. I do not. I am Hamiltonian in my principles, and believe in the power of the centralized government, but I take this opportunity to direct the attention of Congressman DAVIS, who a little while ago referred to Thomas Jefferson in 1806 and the appropriation for the Cumberland road. I say to him that there is a vast difference in the conditions that existed under the reign of that ancient leader of Democracy and under the rule of President Wilson in this day of modern Democracy. Then there was an overflowing Treasury, and the National Government did not know what to do with the money; but to-day there is a wonderful difference in conditions.

But I desire to call your attention further to the fact that in 1825 Thomas Jefferson, at a later period than when he was President, wrote like this:

We declare to be most false and unfounded the doctrine that the compact in authorizing its Federal branch to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States has given them thereby a power to do whatever they may think or pretend would promote the general welfare, which construction would make that of itself a complete government without limitation of powers.

In that same article Jefferson is placing himself in opposition to the internal improvement of roads which he had advocated in 1806. So, in the beginning he was for it and at a later period against it. But when for it he argued that the Constitution be amended to give the Federal Government authority.

The Fort Worth Recorder said, in speaking of this measure:

Looking to the National Government is bad enough when the aid is in the form of assistance in administrative affairs, but it is vastly worse in the form of a gift or gratuity, for it weakens the sense of self-reliance which States as well as individuals must preserve if they would maintain self-respect and develop their best qualities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. COLEMAN. Now, I agree that good roads are most desirable, but, in my judgment, they should be paid for by the local communities, for if there is any proper local function belonging to the State and the subdivisions of the State it is the improvement of their local highways.

Is it not apparent that if you open the door of the Federal Treasury, allowing some localities to take from the Treasury many times over what they pay in, their demands will be pressed year after year with increased vigor, and that it will necessarily result in the redrawing of sectional lines, an unfortunate condition, away from which in recent years we have been steadily traveling, as the States less able to make local improvements, arguing from the inequality in this bill established, go the further length of demanding that the wealthier Commonwealths pay still larger sums for the advantage of their weaker sister communities?

Somebody said on the floor to-day that the bill would increase the development of road building. I think it is more reasonable to contend that it will deter road building, because if the Federal Government is going to hold out the hope to communities that have not been active in self-improvement that they will get money from the Federal Treasury, will they not naturally put off local improvement until they can send some persuasive Congressman to this floor who will bring back home a large appropriation? Will it not necessarily result in electing men to this body on an issue of good roads, instead of upon what would be for the general benefit of this country? [Applause.]

Let us in this body rise up to the height of being national and not local representatives. [Applause.] Congressman SAUNDERS, of Virginia, in his eloquent speech in favor of this measure the other day, said, in effect, that we had passed far from the old idea that improvements of this kind were not within the limits of the Constitution, and while I most heartily agree with him in his statement, I would call his attention and the attention of others to the fact that we have passed far from many of the ideas of the fathers, and from none of them further than this, that the cheapest government is the best government. And whatever the justification for our having passed away from it, there were some people as recently as the Baltimore convention who adhered to it in part when they wrote in their platform, "We demand a return to that simplicity and economy that befits a democratic government." Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have wandered far from this old theory, and it may not be out of place at this critical stage in our history, with Federal taxation rising higher and higher, with a corporation and individual income tax added to our heretofore customs and internal duties, and the burden of an emergency war tax piled thereon, and an inheritance tax advocated from this floor, to suggest that we pause a little and take stock of our political conditions before traveling further in the direction of either European paternalism or European militarism.

Now, observe that the Federal Government has recently departed from its hitherto long-established custom of raising needed revenue at the customhouse and from the indirect internal duties, and has proceeded to collect a tax from corporations and on individual incomes; that by the corporation and income tax it has taken from the States, whatever the justification may be, important sources of revenue; that having trespassed upon the taxable property of the State and applied the revenue obtained, perhaps, in some measure of equality to the people of the entire country, you now propose to take these same revenues and apply them in a most unequal manner to a purely local problem. When you think of the \$80,000,000 being raised from the Federal income tax and the \$52,000,000 from the emergency revenue tax, and this amount added onto our heretofore accustomed sources of revenue, and the Treasury in an almost bankrupt condition, had you not better go slow before opening up new avenues into the Federal Treasury?

I am opposed to the measure because it is an unwarranted departure on the part of the Federal Government from its established policy and an entering upon a work heretofore considered as a purely local problem. I am opposed to the bill because it proposes a most unequal distribution of the Federal taxes for purely local purposes. I am opposed to it because at this time, with taxes already burdensome, no additional demands should be made on the Federal Treasury. I am further opposed to it because unwilling that the Federal Government should be given any additional sources of income than those already enjoyed, by which I mean the customs and internal taxes and the corporation and individual income taxes, believing that no further encroachments on the taxable property of

the individual States at this time should be permitted. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take notice of what the last speaker said, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COLEMAN]. What is the proposition before this Congress? It is, according to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the people of this Republic should not have beneficial legislation in their behalf because the money comes out of the Treasury. The gentleman from Massachusetts the other day, and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] yesterday afternoon, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] this afternoon, stated to this House that the farmers of this country are not entitled to this legislation. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] said that our Republic has given the rural route system and carried mails through muddy roads to the farmers. He thinks that is a great favor which the Congress has conferred upon the people. I just cite the gentleman to the great cities of this Republic where nine mail deliveries are made a day and nothing is thought about it, and he thinks it is a great favor of the Government to carry mail once a day, or perhaps three times a week, to the man out in the country, the great taxpayer and supporter of this Government. It is a right that he has. He is entitled to good roads, and the Federal Government, with all of its activities, should give the farmers of this country roads over which to haul their produce to town.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen who are speaking against this bill and against the farmers of this country have never in their lives heard the notes of a whippoorwill. Gentlemen like that do not know the necessities of the agrarian classes of this country. I believe the Congress of this Republic ought to go as far as it can, and I am honest in that belief, within the bounds of constitutional limitations, to give the agricultural class all privileges and all legislation that will benefit them. I believe that they should have a rural-credit bill establishing a banking system for long-term farm loans at a very low rate of interest, with direct aid from the Federal Government. I believe that the great farming class of this Republic should have all the aid this Republic can give through its Congress, under the Constitution, to further the interests of the farmers. What more would good roads do? They would not only aid the country districts, but to a great extent aid the cities, because of the fact that the wealth comes out of the agricultural class into the cities; and we all recognize the fact that the great manufacturing and farming classes of this Republic must work hand in hand. One can not exist without the other. Surely the man who is fortunate enough to live in a great State like New York, Massachusetts, or Pennsylvania should not for one moment want to hold their fore feet in the Federal Treasury all of the time and keep off a few of these Western and Southern States. The South has been for years paying great pension bills where the people of other sections of the country have had their feet in the long trough drinking all of the slop. Do you mean to say that this road bill, that might take a little revenue from some of the great States of the East that have been preying on this Republic all of these years, should, forsooth, not pass for that reason? My friend from New York said that it would interfere with the "preparedness program." There has been an excuse for the last 50 years to keep the farmers of this Republic from coming into their rights, and at last they have come up with a great scheme to build unwarranted numbers of battleships and establish great armed camps in this Republic to trample on the rights of the farmer and say that he shall not have even a good road to travel over. [Applause.]

I am convinced that the farmers are the last people to be considered when it comes to legislation. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COLEMAN] said the farmer had been considered more than any other class in this Republic. I agree with him in part, but I wish to state that the farmer has been considered mostly as the man to get taxes out of—to pay for all the legislative schemes to further enrich the few.

How can you gentlemen in good faith oppose this bill to have the Federal Government aid in building good roads in every county in Mississippi and every other State of this Union, when you have been voting money out of the Treasury all of these years for every conceivable scheme for the benefit of a few?

The Southern States came out of the war with great debts, and the people impoverished, and heavy taxation has kept them from being able to build the roads you gentlemen from the Eastern States boast of. I am proud that you have such fine roads, and if my people had been situated like your people, we would have just such roads as you are now blessed with.

The \$25,000,000 carried in this bill will do more good than any other similar sum that this Congress could appropriate.

I believe in economy in Government, and have always been a strong advocate of it. I further believe in internal improvement of this country, and am going to vote for all measures that help the people and at the same time add assets and blessings to our country. If we had a splendid system of good roads in every county in the United States, our Nation could have no better asset except the splendid citizenry who would travel the roads.

Mr. Chairman, the farmer is put to a burdensome expense in marketing his crops. I claim that the Government not only owes it to him to help get a good road to haul it over, but I think the Government owes the farmer the further aid of extending the Bureau of Markets and getting in a good state of "preparedness" to help market the product of the farm. The city man and the farmer must be brought closer together. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COLEMAN] thinks the parcel post is for the benefit of no one except the farmer. He is mistaken in that idea, for the very reason that the farmer must be connected with some one on the other end of the line. His connection with the town or city man is going to benefit the town or city man as much as it benefits the farmer. The parcel post is a fine thing for the farmer, but it is not the only thing Congress ought to do to help him. I know this good-road business is not altogether the duty of the Federal Government, but it is manifestly the duty of this great Government to give reasonable aid in constructing roads to carry mail over to the farmers of the rural districts.

The Government has given subsidies to railroads and great corporate interests; now, why should it be prevented from helping the people who need help—the country people of this great Nation? [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on this bill, which proposes to authorize an appropriation of \$25,000,000 to a public-roads fund to be distributed among the States, which I heartily indorse, for which I shall vote, and which I earnestly hope may soon be enacted into law; for there is no question in which the country is more interested than in the question of better roads, and no investment that the Government can make that will yield the return, either immediately or in the future, that an investment in road construction will yield. This statement is substantiated by the fact that the most prosperous communities and the most contented communities of our country are those communities which have a system of model roads.

And it is my fond hope, Mr. Chairman, that the day is not far distant when every section of this great country of ours, from the most densely populated sections to the farthest and most remote and most sparsely settled communities, may enjoy all the blessings that go with, and all the prosperity that accrues by, a thorough and complete system of public highways over which the farmers, the merchants, the lumbermen, the stockmen, and all other classes can convey their products at a minimum cost. All men will profit by an improvement of that kind, and no man will suffer as a result of it.

But a few of our city brethren object to this bill because, as they believe, it will benefit the farmers only. Well, let us analyze the proposition and see if their contentions are well founded, and to do this we must ascertain the relation of the rural community to the city, and the relation of the city to the rural community. Without the city the rural community can not develop and prosper, for its development and prosperity are measured by its markets for its farm products, timber, coal, and other raw materials, the large bulk of which find their markets in the cities. On the other hand, the city can not exist without the rural community to draw from. It must have the timber from the forest with which to build its factories, its storehouses, and its homes. It must have coal from the mines to heat them, and the produce from the farm on which to live. Destroy the cities and the farms will suffer. Destroy the farms and the cities will perish and die. Then, Mr. Chairman, we who come from the farms, we who belong to that strong and mighty army of 12,000,000 farmers upon whom not only the prosperity, but the life as well, of the cities depends, have a right to be proud of the part that we contribute to the life of the Nation, and of the position that we occupy among its men. Not only do we have a right to be proud, but we have a right to be heard in this Hall of national legislation, and a right to be recognized at the disbursing counter of the Federal Treasury. This right has been overlooked by the powers that have heretofore been in control. Until recently the farmers have petitioned the National Congress for recognition, and their petitions have

been disregarded. They have whispered tenderly, and their echoes have fallen on deaf ears.

But, Mr. Chairman, the day has come when they petition no more for recognition, but demand their rights instead. They whisper no more, but speak in positive and certain terms. They are now receiving recognition in this body, and in my candid opinion will likewise receive it at the other end of the Capitol; and, mark my prediction, it will be fatal to those responsible if they fail to receive it. It is true that that we passed a bill of this character through this House in the last Congress which failed of consideration in the other body. But that failure was due to congested conditions and limited time, for which no one was to blame and for which no one was criticized. But conditions are different now. There is plenty of time; there is every reason why this bill should become a law, and not a single valid reason why it should not.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] told us on yesterday that the bill should not pass because it would call for additional expenditures of the people's money. Well, who are the people? Do they reside in New York only? No; they cover this country from ocean to ocean, and from the Lakes to the Gulf; and thousands—yea, millions—of them have never been directly benefited one penny by the Federal expenditures except through the Postal System. And I desire to add here, Mr. Chairman, that the passage of this bill will breathe anew the spirit of life into our Postal System, which is one of our greatest and most advanced agents of civilization, and in which the people are most deeply interested. It will result in the establishment of rural routes all over the country as a result of adequate roads for their operation. It will give the farmer his daily paper, his market report, his magazine, and his parcel post, delivered at his home instead of his having to travel 2, 3, and 4 miles to receive them, as many are forced to do under existing conditions. But, Mr. Chairman, when we mention improved postal facilities for the rural communities, some gentlemen from some of our great cities who have their mail delivered at their doors nine and ten times each day from a magnificent post-office building with stone surface and marble trimmings and floors, constructed and maintained by the Federal Government out of the public funds, remind us in agonizing terms that the postal receipts from those rural communities do not justify the expenditure necessary to their maintenance.

We concede the fact that a very large per cent of the Postal Service of the rural sections is operated at a cost much greater in volume than the revenues derived, while, on the other hand, the service in the cities is not only self-sustaining, but renders a return to the Treasury. But listen, gentlemen: Have not your cities any interest in those rural communities? From whence do these communities draw their wares and merchandise? Why, from the city, of course, either through the mail-order houses by parcel post, or through the local merchant, and he through his local jobber from the factories of the city; and, Mr. Chairman, at this point I venture this suggestion, and do it without fear of successful contradiction, that if the commerce to and from those sections of the country where the Postal Service is not self-sustaining should be withdrawn from the commerce of America, every city throughout the length and breadth of this land would seriously feel the effects, and many of them would be thrown into a panic. Therefore, as we read in Holy Writ, that no man liveth to himself alone, so do we read in the economic history of the nations that no community liveth to itself alone, either city, town, or county. Their interests are mutual and are so interwoven that they can not be distinguished in a commercial sense one from the other. Many of the European nations have long since recognized this fact and through governmental methods have inaugurated the reforms necessary to the welfare of the whole people, while our country has in a large measure been sectional in its public enterprises, thereby overlooking those reforms that are most general in their application.

There are 26,000 miles of navigable rivers in the United States, on which the Federal Government has expended \$475,211,250. Why has it done so? It has done so because these rivers are public highways on which commerce is carried to and from the people. Then, as an economic proposition, if the water routes over which the commerce is carried are of sufficient importance to warrant the expenditure of public funds for the purpose of minimizing the cost of carriage, will not the same principle apply to the land routes over which the same commerce must be carried before it reaches or after it leaves the wharf at the river's bank, and especially so when the greatest reduction of cost will result through the improvement of the overland routes, as is the case, which is proven by the following figures.

An average ton of freight can be carried over the great waterways of the country 1,000 miles for \$1.25. It can be carried 250 miles for that price over the railways of the country and only 3 miles over the average land routes, while in France, England, Germany, and Wales, where the roads are good, the overland charges do not reach half that sum. Then, Mr. Chairman, does it not stand to reason that the best field of investment for the Federal Government in the improvement of routes of commerce is in the overland routes which bring the products of the farm and the forest from their points of production to the points of mobilization where they are loaded on car or boat? Mr. Chairman, I trust that the city dwellers and their entire quota of Representatives on this floor may soon realize that they, as well as the citizens of the rural community, will profit by better roads in the rural communities over which their food products and much of their raw material must first travel. Better roads in those communities will lessen the cost of transportation, which is a very noticeable element in the cost of these products to the consumer. As I have previously stated, the interests of the people of both the city and country are mutual, and I sincerely trust that the day is not far distant when the imaginary walls or prejudices between them shall be torn down, or at least forgotten, on the floors of the House and Senate of the United States Congress. It is true that when legislation is proposed here to construct public improvements in the cities there comes more or less opposition from some of the country districts; and, on the other hand, when we propose to appropriate money for the improvement of roads in the country we find opposition from the city districts, but not from all city Members, I am proud to say. But, Mr. Chairman, this is all wrong. There should be no such feeling existing among the Representatives of the American people. We are all one people, citizens of one country, and we are, or should be, interested in all sections of the country, and should strive in a spirit of harmony and unison to make it a greater and better country; and we can only do that by the improvement of both the cities and the country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my main object in addressing the House is to refer briefly to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] who addressed the House on yesterday afternoon and the vociferous gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] who spoke a few minutes ago and who grew so pompous and bombastic that it was difficult for us to tell which side of the question he was on. These gentlemen, who reside in coast-line States which have harbors fortified and maintained by the Federal Government, oppose the passage of this bill on the ground that its application, if enacted into law, will be local and not national in character. I want to ask these gentlemen what they think of the forts and harbors on the coasts of their States. Are they local or national propositions? Of course they will say that they are national and should be maintained by the Federal Government, and we all agree that they are; and now, if by lack of proper harbor defense, the cities and coasts that are under the protection of these harbors should be bombarded and destroyed by the guns of a hostile fleet, who would suffer the greater loss, the citizens of the destroyed cities or the citizens of the interior who are hundreds or thousands of miles away? Why, the citizens of the unfortunate cities would, of course, be the principal sufferers. Therefore the benefits derived from our harbor defenses accrue primarily and directly to the citizens who live in the cities and on the coasts thus protected, and these harbors and forts, 27 in number and constructed along the coasts of the United States, on which the Federal Government has up to this time expended \$126,000,000, are local institutions from a geographic point of view, for the people living under their immediate protection are primarily and directly benefited by them, but the country as a whole receives an indirect benefit from them as a national defense, which makes them national in character. And, Mr. Chairman, the same argument will apply to public roads over which the people travel from community to community, from city to country, and from State to State, and over which the mail and the commerce of the people are carried from locality to locality, from city to country, and from State to State.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentlemen who are opposing this bill are advocates of stronger national defense. But will they contend that the strength of our national defense lies solely in, and is measured solely by, the number of men and guns that we possess? Do they not know that the transportation and mobilization of our resources which go to make up the supplies of our Army and Navy are also important elements in our national defense? Therefore would not a better system of roads, which constitute a part of our great international transportation

system, over which are transported our soldiers and their food and other supplies necessary to their maintenance and operation, add to the efficiency of our Naval and Military Establishments? Why, Mr. Chairman, we are told by our military experts that the question of transportation is one of the very important questions in our national defense, and that the War Department and transportation companies of the country are now considering plans for a more adequate and more rapid system for times of need, and the importance of this system, Mr. Chairman, is not limited to its operations between the various Army posts of the country, but it extends over our waterways, railroads, and land routes to every nook and hamlet of this great country, from whence comes the volunteer soldiers and the supplies necessary to the maintenance of the Army. So, from a standpoint of national defense, our roads overland are interstate routes, and are not local in character, and they are most assuredly not as local in character or benefits as the fortified national harbors to which I have previously referred.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes, sir; I yield.

Mr. ROGERS. Has the gentleman read the committee report recommending the adoption of this measure?

Mr. FIELDS. I have.

Mr. ROGERS. Does the gentleman recall that in two places in that report it is specifically stated that roads are local concerns?

Mr. FIELDS. I am comparing our public-roads system, as a part of our national defense, with the fortified harbors on our coasts, which also constitute a part of our national defense, but which, geographically, are, as the gentleman classes our public roads, local concerns extending their direct protection, their immediate and direct benefits to the people who live within their shadows, insuring them protection against foreign enemies. And yet these concerns were constructed and are maintained by the Federal Treasury out of the people's money. Seven million dollars have been spent up to this time on Boston Harbor in the gentleman's own State and \$13,000,000 have been spent up to this time on New York Harbor; and it is being urged by Members from that State that a great deal more should be expended on it to properly insure the safety of the city of New York, and yet the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] thinks that this bill, which proposes to distribute \$25,000,000 of the public funds, or less than twice the amount that has been expended on New York Harbor, to the farming sections of the country, is both vicious and criminal. And the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] says that he "is amazed," terribly amazed, utterly and woefully amazed, that a committee of Congress should bring out a bill which proposes to appropriate the public funds in this way.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I claim to be a rigid economist, and I think that my record for economy in the expenditure of the public funds will compare favorably with the record of the gentleman from the Hudson [Mr. PLATT], and as an evidence of my sincerity I want to make him this proposition: If he will agree that the various vicinities along the sea coasts, wherein harbors have been fortified and are maintained by the Government, will return to the Government the \$126,000,000 which it has thus far appropriated to the harbors, and agree to henceforth and forever maintain them at their own expense, I will take the liberty to say for the farmers that they will never again ask Congress to appropriate money for the construction or maintenance of public roads. But the gentleman will not accept my proposition, for he knows the farmers would get the better end of the deal. But he will continue to urge Congress to enlarge its sums for harbor defense, which is probably a wise and equitable doctrine, for our citizens along our coast lines are American citizens, and are entitled to adequate protection by their Government to insure their happiness and prosperity. But Mr. Chairman, while the enormous expenditures necessary to maintain our coast defenses are being drawn from the Public Treasury, I, for one, am unwilling to overlook or neglect the interests of those who reside in the interior of our country. I am unwilling to hush my voice in the cause of the farmer and his neighbor in the rural community, but to the contrary I shall contend so long as I am a Member of this body for his rights under the Government. And so long as the Congress shall appropriate public funds, just that long the farmers are entitled to their part of the amount appropriated; and, Mr. Chairman, every dollar appropriated to the public roads of the country will yield a due return to the Government, not only in revenue, but in the increased happiness and greater patriotism of the people, in better and more accessible schools in which to educate our children, more favorable environments under

which to reverence and honor our flag, and more accessible churches in which to worship God. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I desire to register my approval of this bill primarily because it is a good-roads measure, and because, in my judgment, the Roads Committee has presented a plan as feasible, fair, and just as can be worked out on this proposition. Of all the criticisms that have been made, not a single Member up to this time has offered a suggestion that would improve the present bill. The plan worked out by the committee and embodied in this bill as nearly embraces every element of fairness and justice to all sections and to all the States as would appear practical from anything that has been said or from any suggestion that has been made. Therefore, I see no place for the sectionalism and provincialism that has entered into this discussion. For one, I am glad that Congress has seen fit to improve the great ports of the country like those at New York and Boston, because those ports are of interest to every American citizen and facilitate the handling of the products of the farm as well as the commerce of the cities.

This legislation is simply the reflection of national good-roads sentiment; is an act responsive to the general belief that the United States should assist in building and maintaining the highways over which the mails are carried, and the general demand that Congress enact legislation for that purpose.

In the enactment of this or like legislation the Congress should at least ask and have answered two questions—one as to the jurisdiction of the United States, and the other as to the number of American people to be benefited. The first is answered by the Constitution, which provides "that Congress shall have power to establish post offices and post roads." Reliable statistics will answer the second. There are in the United States 43,652 rural mail routes, with a combined length of 1,060,679 miles, over which travel 48,534 rural letter carriers, who for six days in each week deliver mail to more than 20,000,000 people at their homes, traveling annually 322,431,662 miles and carrying more than 3,000,000,000 pieces of mail.

There are 11,970 star routes, with a total length of 153,350 miles. These star routes reach the more remote sections in the rural districts with an estimated population of about 10,000,000 people. Hence this legislation would benefit directly more than 30,000,000 people, and indirectly our entire population.

We can not enact any law, we can not make any appropriation that would reach, help, and benefit a greater number of our people who deserve so well at the hands of this Congress than will this proposed road law and the appropriation it provides for.

Those living along these rural post roads, carrier and star routes make up practically our farming population, who I feel safe to say, have by all political parties been promised more and received less in performance than any other great class in this country, and for us now to enact this law would be a partial redemption of some of our pledges, and, at least, the liquidation of a portion of the accumulated interest on our unperformed promises.

The heaviest tax paid in this country is the bad-road tax. It has been estimated by the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Agriculture that we have 2,500,000 miles of public roads. Over these roads are carried annually 350,000,000 tons of freight, consisting of farm products, supplies, and other articles. The average haul per ton is 8 miles. Over the unimproved road the cost per ton-mile is 23 cents, or \$1.84 per ton for the average haul of 8 miles. Over the improved or surfaced road the cost per ton-mile is 13 cents, or \$1.04 per ton for the average haul of 8 miles—a saving of 80 cents per ton. Hence on 350,000,000 tons, with universal good roads, the annual saving would be \$280,000,000. So from a business standpoint no investment for the public could excel that made in building and maintaining the public roads.

Now, I would like to call the attention of those gentlemen who have spoken against this bill charging it with being class legislation—a discrimination against the cities—to some facts: The mail is carried to and from these great cities in the North, East, West, and South over trunk lines of railroads and with all the promptness, speed, and security that the mind of man and money can conceive, plan, and execute, and that for the building of these railway systems Congress donated millions of acres of the richest portion of the national domain worth hundreds of millions of dollars. It does seem that in view of all this we should not meet this protest against a bill which proposes to spend the proportionately small sum of \$25,000,000 for the benefit of the mail service in the rural districts.

In Louisiana we are now spending annually \$2,500,000 on our roads. Under this bill we would receive \$345,064, which would come to us not only as a relief but in greater value as an encouragement to scientific road building.

This measure will materially assist in bringing about the three conditions essentially necessary to make life on the farm attractive, viz, good schools, good society, and good roads—good schools in which the farmer may know that his sons and daughters can receive the foundations of culture, good society in which is developed mutual sympathy and united effort for the advancement of the common good, and good roads for easy transportation of his products and for quick communication with his neighbors, his institutions, and the outside world.

To hasten the fulfillment of these conditions would be the effect of this legislation, and it should, in my humble judgment, have the approval of this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] ask unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMPSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, the debate on this good-roads bill has demonstrated three things: First, that those States that have been the greatest beneficiaries of our tariff legislation are unalterably opposed to any bill that appropriates money out of the Federal Treasury that will be in any way beneficial to the great farming and producing masses of this country; second, that those who oppose the bill are not so much opposed to the amount of money that it appropriates as they are to the use to which it is to be put; and, third, the agitation for preparedness is to be used as a device to prevent all appropriations for internal improvements.

These three propositions, I think, are amply sustained by the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] in his discussion of the bill on last Wednesday and the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] and those made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] on yesterday. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], in the course of his remarks, said:

I say, sir, that this legislation is not wise, and I want to call the attention of the gentlemen on this side of the House especially to the fact that this is one of the measures which for several years has been in the platform of the Democratic Party.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is correct in that statement. The Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore in 1912 contained this plank:

We favor national aid to State and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post roads.

This platform declaration of the Democratic Party at Baltimore was but a reiteration of the Democratic platform on this subject adopted at Denver in 1908, practically in the same words, and the Democratic Party has endeavored in good faith to carry out this promise made to the great producing masses of the country. As soon as it was trusted with power by the people of the country and a Democratic House took over the control of legislation in March, 1911, the lower House of the Sixty-second Congress, which was the only branch of the Government that was Democratic, passed a good-roads bill. In the Sixty-third Congress we again passed a good-roads bill, and we are now about to redeem our pledge for the third time by passing this good-roads bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] said further:

While the Republican Party has not incorporated a plank for Federal aid but has simply asserted its belief in them and recommended the improvement of them to the several States of the Union.

I am perfectly willing for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] to define the position of the Republican Party on this great question, and it is in exact keeping with the provisions of the Republican platform of 1908 on which Mr. Taft was elected to the Presidency, though they did not go even to that extent in 1912, and the subject was not mentioned in their platform in 1904. The position of the Republican Party as gathered from the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and their platform declaration is that they are willing that the people should have good roads provided the people themselves go down into their own pockets and dig up the money with which to construct them.

I am surprised that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] should take this position, in view of the fact that for more than 100 years the people of the United States, by a system of tariff taxation, have been building up the great indus-

tries of Massachusetts and making it one of the richest and greatest States in this Union.

What has the Government done for other lines of development? We appropriated for river and harbor purposes between 1789 and 1910, \$583,895,000; for fortifications between 1820 and 1910, \$130,625,000. We are spending to support the Army and Navy annually the sum of nearly \$250,000,000. We spent in the construction of the Panama Canal nearly \$400,000,000. Unthinkable millions have been collected from the people to build up our manufacturing industries. The Government has contributed to the railroads of our country 158,294,870 acres of our public domain to assist and encourage their construction. This land at the market price would produce \$5,000,000,000—a sum sufficient to build and equip every line of railroad in the United States. We have appropriated for furthering irrigation projects in the arid regions of the West, \$36,933,643.78. We appropriated \$35,000,000 to build a Government railroad in Alaska. Our intervention in the war between Spain and Cuba has cost us more than a thousand million dollars. It is now being urged upon Congress to erect residences for our ministers and ambassadors to foreign countries, at an estimated cost of about \$10,000,000.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] in the course of his remarks on this bill yesterday, in reply to a statement from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], said:

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The gentleman is talking about preparedness. Does he know of any way by which \$25,000,000 could be used for preparedness to better advantage under the present circumstances than by the building of good roads?

Mr. ROGERS. Oh, I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] made a complete answer to that inquiry in his questioning of the last speaker. The bill does not contemplate using this money exclusively or at all, for military roads. That would be a different proposal. But here every lane and highway and byway of the Nation may be the recipient of Federal funds. The very first sentence in the bill says:

"That for the purpose of this act the term 'rural post roads' shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is or might be carried."

Any little cow path is just as much entitled to this aid as the Lincoln Highway from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

I gather from this statement that the opposition to this bill is not based so much on the idea it contains or the amount of money it appropriates as it is to the purpose for which the money is to be used. The gentleman said that the purpose that was contained in this bill was a proposition to aid in the construction of cow trails, meaning, I presume, that it was intended to aid in the construction of roads from the farm, where the products that go to feed the multiplied millions of this earth are produced, to the railroad station, from whence they are shipped to the great centers of population where they are to be used. He further said that this appropriation was not to be used in the construction of great interstate highways like the Lincoln Highway or the Old Trails Association, reaching from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT], in his speech on this bill, urged as an objection to its passage the fact that we would soon be called upon to raise large sums of money for the so-called purpose of preparedness, and he criticized the patriotism of those who would appropriate money for the purpose of constructing good roads that might interfere with this program of preparedness. He said:

But what shall be said of Democrats who pursue such a policy? Will they not be regarded as traitors? Will the bribe of a few paltry dollars for their districts procure them forgiveness?

If a Member of Congress is to be denounced as a traitor to his country because he refuses to go wild in favor of appropriating untold billions of dollars to build warships and organize large standing armies when there is no enemy in sight and because he votes the small and insignificant sum of \$25,000,000 to aid in the construction of good roads from the farm, where the products are produced, to the railroad station, where they are shipped, thereby increasing the price to the producer and decreasing the cost to the consumer, I am content to have the term traitor applied to me.

I desire briefly to call attention to the condition of the farmers of this country, as shown by the census figures. During the 10 years from 1900 to 1910 the population of the cities increased 34.8 per cent. The rural population during the same period increased 11.2 per cent. The per cent of increase in the city population was a little more than three times that of the increase in the rural population, and in making this estimate the Census Bureau included as a part of the rural population all towns having a population of 2,500 or less. The real increase as between the two classes of population is, therefore, much more than the census figures show. The per cent of increase in the number of farms from 1900 to 1910 was

10.0. The increase in the number of farms and the increase in rural population was practically the same, demonstrating the necessity of increasing the farming population if the number of farms are to be increased. In 1910 there were 6,361,502 farms in the United States and there were 2 per cent less owners and 2½ per cent more tenants living on farms than in 1900. In 1900, 31 per cent of the farms were under mortgage. In 1910, 33.6 per cent were under mortgage. In 1900 there were 67,719,410 cattle, 62,868,041 swine, and 61,503,713 sheep in the United States. In 1910 there were 61,803,866 cattle, 58,185,676 swine, and 52,441,861 sheep, a decrease during the 10 years from 1900 to 1910 of 5,915,544 cattle, 4,682,365 swine, and 9,055,852 sheep—8.7 per cent decrease in the number of cattle, 7.4 per cent decrease in the number of swine, and 14.7 per cent decrease in the number of sheep, and average decrease of 10.2 per cent in the source of our meat supply as against an increase in population in the entire country, including both the city and rural districts, of 21 per cent.

In 1900 we produced 1,619,415,263 pounds of butter; in 1910, 1,491,652,602 pounds. In 1900 we produced 298,344,642 pounds of cheese; in 1910, 320,532,181 pounds, an increase of only 0.07 per cent. In 1900 we exported 209,348,284 bushels of corn; in 1910 we exported 36,802,374 bushels, a decrease of 172,545,910 bushels within the 10-year period.

By comparison it will be found that the quantity of the present crops produced in the United States increased about 10 per cent between 1900 and 1910. This increase is substantially the same rate as the increase in the number of farms, which is 10.9 per cent, and the increase in the acreage, which was 9.9 per cent, the aggregate average production of these crops per farm and per acre remaining substantially unchanged during the decade, while the population of the country increased at a rate more than twice as great as the crop production, and the increase in the population of our cities being three and one-half times as great. These figures need no elaboration; no comment. They speak a condition which, if permitted to continue even for an inconsiderable length of time, as we reckon time, with the rapid increase in population, will bring want and hunger to the country. There were 6,361,502 farms in the United States according to the census of 1910. Of these 1,327,439, valued at \$6,330,236,951, were mortgaged for \$1,736,172,351, or 27.3 per cent of their value.

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay.
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade,
A breath can make them, as a breath has made;
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroyed can never be supplied.

Mr. Chairman, these prophetic words of Oliver Goldsmith, the Irish bard, uttered back in 1770, are applicable to conditions in the United States to-day. If the Congress of the United States continues to neglect the laboring and producing masses of the country, while it lavishes appropriations running into the billions for the purposes of war; the improvement of creeks, over which not as much freight is carried in the course of a year as is transported over an ordinary country road leading from the farm to the railroad station, we will soon be face to face with the condition which the British Parliament had to solve in Ireland less than half a century ago and which has called for an appropriation of two and one-half billion dollars out of the British Treasury to encourage a movement back to the farm in order that the British Nation might produce enough within its own borders to supply the necessities of its people. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR.] [Applause.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about this bill for just a few moments for the purpose of getting my record straight. Four years ago and two years ago the committee reported and the House passed a very different kind of road bill. From my standpoint the committee has rather gotten the subject tangled up. Four years ago, when I first came to the House, we had no Roads Committee in the House, and a private committee was established under the chairmanship of the present distinguished and able Representative from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], the chairman of this committee, and that private committee prepared a road bill, which was put on as a rider to the Post Office appropriation bill and passed by the House that year. Substantially the same bill was passed by this House again last year. Now, that bill that has passed the House twice was a very different bill from the one that is before the House now. The bill that was passed at the last session of Congress and the session before that was a farmer's bill in a very large sense, and the bill that is before the House now is an automobilist's bill to a substantial extent. I wonder why some of our city friends are opposing it? It is quite as much in their interest as it is in the farmers' interest. I will

explain to you what I mean. I have nothing in the world against automobilists. I am burdened with a piece of that kind of property myself, and I live in the city, too. But I believe that the primary object of this kind of legislation is to help the farmers of the country, and we ought to pass that kind of a bill that would help them in the most substantial way. The bill of last year will benefit the farmers most of all, and that was the main purpose of the legislation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I greatly regret to have to disagree with the conclusions of the committee in reporting this bill. I always like to agree with the committee. I want to say that I believe that the bill which passed this House last year is by far the better plan. It is a plan that is absolutely free from any constitutional objection. It is a plan that gives the greatest encouragement to the building of roads in every part of the country. It is a plan that is free from favoritism. It is a plan that will be of the greatest benefit to the rural letter carriers of the country—these Government agents that are required to go now along all kinds of roads and in all kinds of weather and who are of such great value to the farmer. It is a plan that gives to all the people the benefits of good roads.

Speaking for my own State, I want to say to the Members of this House that in a recent campaign I made this particular bill one of the issues of the campaign. It was an issue, too, that was heartily approved by the people. It was a plan that particularly appealed to the people because of its lack of favoritism, because it provided roads, not for the benefit of any class, not for the benefit of any particular locality, but in such a way that every class and every locality had an equal show to receive the benefits of the act. Speaking from actual experience, therefore, I believe that this House will make a great mistake if we change our bill now and adopt a different plan of aid to roads. The distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], than whom there is not a stronger advocate of roads in this House or elsewhere, and who has worked early and late for the cause, says that the reason for the change in the plan is because we have passed this bill twice in the House and have not been able to pass it in the Senate. I want to say to the gentleman and to other Members of this House that it is a mighty doubtful policy to swap horses in the middle of the stream. That plan certainly has had for two sessions the hearty approval of this House and, I believe, the approval of the people, and I do not believe that if we had passed the present plan in either of the former Congresses that the present plan would have been enacted into law. I believe those Senators who are opposed to the bill as constructed last session and the session before would have been opposed to the present plan, and when we undertake a change the chances are we will dissipate our strength.

Now, what is the difference between the two bills? I want to explain to you, if I may, just for a moment, the difference between the bill that you gentlemen passed last year and the bill that you are asked to pass this year. It is this: Last year all the roads of the country were divided into three classes, and all the roads of the country that conformed to those classes were to receive Federal aid to road building. This year we have adopted an entirely different policy. We are going to turn the appropriations over to the State highway commissions of the several States, and they are going to select, with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, certain roads to be improved. The roads thus selected will, of course, form a very small percentage of all the roads in any State, and for that reason I do not think this bill is nearly so good as the bill that this House has passed upon twice and by which bill all the people would receive the benefits of the legislation.

Now, gentlemen, I am going to offer the bill that passed last year as a substitute for this bill when this bill comes on its passage. I believe that that bill is the better bill in every respect. I believe it is better because there is less favoritism about it. I believe it is better because more people get the benefits of Federal aid under it than will get them under this bill. I believe it is better for the reason that it will encourage State and county road building a hundredfold more than the present bill will do.

Now, mind you, I am going to vote for the present bill if I can not get the one that we passed last year. But why make this change? What is the reason for this change? This House has gone on record twice in saying that the bill of last year is a good bill and ought to become a law. Why is it that we make this change at this late day?

I have not seen a satisfactory answer given to that question. There may be one. I do not mean to say that there is not one. I certainly have great confidence in this committee, but I can not understand why "this horse was swapped in the middle of the stream."

I want to point out this, that I found by a recent experience that a bill of the kind we passed last year—a bill for Federal aid to road building—is a very popular bill.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. DENISON. What became of the other bill that passed the House twice?

Mr. McKELLAR. It failed in the Senate.

Mr. DENISON. Has it occurred to the gentleman that that fact perhaps had something to do with it?

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, as I said before, if the present bill had been passed by Congress last year or the year before it would have failed just as that one failed. It was not the peculiar form of that bill that caused its defeat. It was opposition to the whole policy.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is unwilling yet to speak for the Senate, I suppose?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am unwilling. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. We are all mighty glad that the gentleman is going to be in the Senate, but we all regret his departure from this House. [Applause.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] for the kind words that he has just said about me. I appreciate them very much.

Now, I want to say to the other gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON], who interrupted me just a little while ago, that I do not believe it makes a particle of difference what kind of a road bill we passed at the last session or the session before that. It was doomed to failure in the Senate. I will say to the gentleman that when we first began this propaganda four years ago we did not have a Committee on Roads in this House. And more than that, we who actively interested ourselves in the road movement here were published and advertised all over this country and designated as "dirt-roads statesmen" in derision, and yet in the short time of four years we find public sentiment has changed entirely and now there is a demand all over the country for Federal aid to roads, and instead of my distinguished friend here [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], the chairman of this great committee, being now termed a "dirt-roads statesman" he is one of the greatest statesmen in the country because he is at the head of this Federal road-building movement. [Applause.]

Having views that I have heretofore expressed, I am going to offer the bill of last year as a substitute for this bill, and I want to urge you gentlemen of this House before you vote to weigh carefully what you do. You have to go before all of the people of your several districts, and you are going to find that it will be hard to explain to the people why you abandoned a plan that is peculiarly in their interest, peculiarly in the farmers' interest, and adopted a plan that gives only certain routes and certain localities an opportunity to be improved. To give to these favorite localities indeed a great improvement, and I may say a much desired improvement, but at the same time leaving the vast body of your district, and perhaps many entire districts, without any Federal aid and without any Federal encouragement to State or county road building.

For those with these views I have reintroduced the bill which was passed by this House on February 10, 1914, and am going to offer it as a substitute for the committee's bill at the proper time. I do this because I believe it is a far better bill than the one the committee has reported out this session. If the substitute fails, I shall then support the present bill as being a step in the right direction. If the substitute is not adopted, I shall greatly regret to give up that plan, but I shall vote for the bill as reported out of the committee on the ground that it is the best that we can get. I am so heartily in favor of Federal aid to roads that I prefer to have a bill that does not meet my best judgment rather than to have no bill at all.

Gentlemen, I thank you very much. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back two minutes.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I feel very much like the old lady felt in the Methodist prayer meeting. I would like to add my "testimony" to what the "brother" has just said.

It so happens that I was the first Democrat, by the actual record and not by claim, to introduce a bill similar, but in my humble judgment more liberal than the one now before the House. I did that on the 21st day of April, 1911. I hold in my hand a copy of the speech I delivered in the House on the 29th of Feb-

ruary, 1912, on the question of Federal aid to public highways. That happened to be the first speech made under the Democratic organization for Federal aid to public highways, and the burden of converting all these brothers that we hear now supporting this good-roads movement devolved upon me; and I am proud of the job that I so well did. [Laughter and applause.]

I heard a gentleman this afternoon speaking about Federal aid for public highways, and I remember shortly after the delivery of my speech in 1912 he came into the cloakroom and made a remark about the impossibility of the Government ever appropriating money for roads and the foolhardiness of a young, "tender-footed" Congressman butting his head against a brick wall; and yet he made one of the best speeches I have heard in support of this bill, so I felt at liberty, as the original Federal-aid-to-public-highways man in this House, by the record, to say a few words to my city brothers. [Laughter.]

This bill in its operation is not such a bill as I would like to have seen enacted into law, because the wealthier States of the Nation, which have made greater advancement on account of their large taxable values than the purely agricultural States and the sparsely settled sections of the country, will receive the greatest benefit from this legislation, while the exact antithesis of this condition should be true. The purely agricultural and less able States of the Union, from a standpoint of taxable values, should receive the greater portion of the appropriation.

The object of this legislation, Mr. Chairman, is dual. Avoiding the unconstitutionality of the Government's appropriating money for such purposes in the States, the money expended under this bill is to be applied to roads over which rural delivery routes are operated. Under the regulations of the Post Office Department these rural delivery routes are operated only over those roads which justify the establishment of the rural route and which can be traversed readily by horse-drawn vehicles the year round.

Recently the Post Office Department has made what I conceive to be, so far as my State is concerned, a most grievous error in attempting to establish motor car service over the rural delivery routes generally. The mistake consists only in the department attempting to put on a service that would be most acceptable and economical but for the fact that the major portion of the roads over which rural delivery routes now operate are still unimproved.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, one of the great pieces of legislation passed in the Sixty-second Congress can not and will not be fully developed or its beneficent influence fully realized until the rural carrier can conveniently and more rapidly transport parcel-post mail. The use of the parcel post is only in its infancy, and the service will not reach the maximum of its usefulness until this country has on all of its rural delivery routes a network of permanent highways traversible every day in the year without inconvenience.

Therefore, the complaint registered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] is a complaint that any Member representing a large city, filled with glaring electric lights, asphalt-paved streets, and smooth sidewalks could register. It is a purely selfish one. He could say the same thing to his neighbor whose house had been unroofed by a cyclone: "I care not for my neighbor, whose family is exposed to the cold and the rain; the roof of my house remains intact."

There was a great statesman, one of the greatest that this continent ever produced, broad minded and generous, who could look out of his library window and his vision encompassed the entire Nation. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Massachusetts will peruse the great speech of the immortal Webster in his reply to Hayne I am sure it will broaden his vision and he can see benefits accruing to the entire Nation instead of demanding that all internal improvements be made within sight of his own front door. Mr. Webster said, upon the occasion when Mr. Hayne asked the question, "What interest has South Carolina in a canal in Ohio?"—

Sir, we narrow-minded people of New England do not reason thus. Our notion of things is entirely different. We look upon the States not as separated, but as united. We love to dwell on that Union and on the mutual happiness which it has so much promoted and on the renown which it has so greatly contributed to acquire. In our contemplation Carolina and Ohio are parts of the same country—States united under the same General Government, having interests common, associated, intermingled. We do not impose geographical limits to our patriotic feelings or regard. We do not follow rivers and mountains and lines of latitude to find boundaries beyond which public improvements do not benefit us.

Mr. Chairman, there are three modes of transportation—public roads, railroads, and water. The railroads and great trans-Atlantic steamboats, carrying our commerce to the uttermost parts of the earth, are absolutely dependent upon the public highways of the Nation for their traffic. If it were not for the

plodding farmer in the remote country districts of this Nation and the public highways leading to the great railway systems and to the navigable rivers of the Nation the people in the great civic centers would soon become the prey of hunger and be scattered over the face of the earth in search of food.

Mr. Chairman, it is estimated that good roads would add from \$2 to \$10 per acre to land values. The total area of farm lands in the United States is about 900,000,000 acres. It is estimated an increase of \$5 an acre by the construction of good roads would add to our taxable values \$4,500,000,000 per annum.

One of the greatest drawbacks to the farmer is the fact that under the present condition of the roads throughout the country he is practically isolated from market during the winter months. This is not only true in the South, where we do not have the continuous hard freezes incident to the climate of the States farther north, but it is true in practically nine-tenths of the States in the Union. No matter what prices corn, wheat, cotton, or other farm products are quoted at on a given day, if the roads are impassable the farmer is helpless to take advantage of the high prices; then when the roads are in passable condition and the great bulk of the staple crops is still in the hands of the farmer a general movement to market necessarily follows, depressing prices, and the farmer is the loser thereby.

Another great tax upon the farmers of the country attributable to bad roads is that at the very time the farmer should be hauling all of his fertilizers and going to market for all of his supplies he finds the roads impassable, and he is compelled to take good weather when he could be tilling the soil of his farm, to market his crops, and to do the necessary hauling incident to his farming activities.

Mr. Chairman, for the last few years we have been continually hearing the cry from every source of "Back to the farm." The brainy boys and girls of our rural districts are continually seeking to escape the social conditions prevalent in the country during the long, dreary, winter months of the year, attributable almost entirely to bad roads. The drift of our population from the rural districts to the cities is really becoming alarming. Much of the social isolation has been ameliorated by the extension of telephone lines in the country and rural free delivery, but these great conveniences do not yet satisfy those who live upon the farm. Instead of the winter months in the rural districts being the most pleasant and profitable of the year, they mean absolute social isolation. Bad roads prevent attendance at school and church; they make literary societies, social gatherings, club and lodge meetings practically impossible during the bad weather of the winter.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that I know the people who live upon the farms of this country as well as anyone. They are the most sociable people on the face of the earth. They love to go to church; they are ambitious to send their children to school. They love to visit one another and exchange ideas; they love to visit the sick; and when the week end comes they want to go to the nearest village store. The Representatives in this House who live in the large cities, either in an apartment house or in a private dwelling, can not appreciate these people. If a newcomer goes into the community, all the neighbors go and visit him and welcome him in their midst, but we can live in the large cities in an apartment house or next door to a family for 10 years and never know their names. So the cry of back to the farm will not be met, in my opinion, until something is done to make country life more attractive and the development of the farm more rapid.

In 1850, 12.5 per cent of the population of the United States were living in cities of 2,500 or over; in 1890, 35 per cent; in 1900, 40 per cent; in 1910, 46 per cent.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is my sincere hope that I may yet live to see the day dawn when this great lawmaking body will recognize that the future of this Nation depends largely upon the activities of this Government in making rural life more attractive by extending to the man on the farm many of the advantages that he does not now enjoy, and it affords me great pleasure to cast my vote for the bill under consideration, which I believe will ultimately do more for the upbuilding of the rural districts of this Nation than all the other legislation written upon the statute books in half a century.

Mr. Chairman, as I said in the outset this bill is not all that I had hoped for, but it is the best that could be done at this time under the unusual existing conditions. I hope that in the future these appropriations may be greatly increased and that the Government will, with the cooperation of the several States of the Union, rapidly construct a system of highways throughout the Nation second to none on the face of the globe, and in my judgment it will be the greatest asset and the richest legacy

we can leave to posterity as a monument to the wisdom of the Democratic Party.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER]. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, in the limited time of five minutes it is impossible, of course, to say much about the merits of this bill, and therefore I must ask the privilege of extending my remarks.

Since I have been in Congress it has been my pleasure to support the bills that have come before the House which have directly affected the rural communities of our country. Out of more than a billion dollars that are appropriated each year for the expenses of the Government to carry on its business in all of its different departments, the amount that goes directly for the improvement of farming is less than 5 per cent.

We who represent Illinois upon this floor believe that it is a great State, and we realize, of course, that it is a rich State. I think Illinois does as many things for itself without calling on the Federal Government as any State in the Union. I believe we can put our record against that of any of the 47 other States. But when it comes to building roads throughout the States, that is an expensive proposition, and to levy taxes for that purpose upon the farms of Illinois will cost the farmers a good deal of money, which must be paid by taxation on the land. We have in our State a highway law and we appropriate each year for roads several hundred thousand dollars that goes to the different counties. We have also local taxation, which does build some roads; but, as we all realize, it is a slow process, and the farmers of this country need encouragement in this work.

I do not so closely question the constitutionality of this and other propositions as some gentlemen do, yet every man who serves upon this floor takes an oath to support the Constitution of the United States to the best of his ability as he understands it. But there are many questions that come here which are not free from doubt to a layman, who does not look at these questions from the standpoint of a lawyer, and he is apparently just as much in doubt as we are. I have listened to great lawyers who argued constitutional questions well upon both sides of this proposition; and in the end if this House passes a law which is unconstitutional, after we have used our best judgment, then it will go to another place, where the question of its constitutionality will be finally determined. As to myself, I believe that I am responsible to the constituents who have sent me here whom I try to represent upon this floor.

If there is a question of doubt in reference to the Constitution—which I do not believe there is in this case—I am willing to give the benefit of that doubt to the side which I believe to be right and which does the people the most good. There is one feature of this bill that is not satisfactory to me, and that is the section which, in my judgment, would enable the Secretary of Agriculture to send men out all over the country to inspect the roads. There might be an army of these employees scattered throughout the country. It is my judgment that we should trust the local and State highway commissioners or the governor, through his agents, to certify to the Secretary of Agriculture that the work has been properly done, and I hope to have such an amendment adopted that will meet this condition.

The only difficulty about expending \$25,000,000 among all the States of the Union is that it is only a small beginning. Yet this small beginning is an encouragement to the people of all the local communities throughout the United States to help build their own roads. In Illinois we have the Dixie Trail; we have the Lincoln Trail, the Logan-Lee Highway; we have the National Road, the State Road, and all sorts of roads running over the State of Illinois, and the laying out of those roads encourages the people all through the neighboring part of the country to improve the condition of their local roads and make them better.

It occurs to me that of all the appropriations made by Congress directly to the people for improvements that none would be of more benefit than this bill in the aid of hard roads. It is said that those in the cities would get no benefit from the appropriations that improve the country roads. I would ask those who live in the city to consider that it is to their interest in building up a great city that there should be easy access to get in and out; that the roads should be improved; that they are interested in the proper system of roads that carry freight in the country and out of the country; and that they must remember that every farmer is located out a distance from the railroad and farm produce must be hauled to the station for shipment to the city. There has been for a number of years agitation to keep young men upon the farm. It is realized that too many of them leave the farm and seek employment of one kind or another in the city, and an effort has been made to try and

prevent this condition. The last census showed that in a number of counties of certain States throughout the United States the rural population has decreased very materially.

Illinois, in more than 1,000 townships, in the rural communities lost in population. The last census showed an increase of 37 per cent in tenant farmers in the United States, so that with this large increase something should be done to stop this condition which in the end, if kept up, must ruin our rural class. The Industrial Commission, which lately made its report, showed in one great State the horrible example of tenant farmers and the increase of tenants on the farm each year. We can not expect to have the prosperous rural community and have renters on the farm. The farm should be owned by the man living on it just so far as possible, and encouragement should be given in a substantial way to assist him to own a farm. In this country we do not want to build up a system of landlordism, and our people will not tolerate it, for, in the end, it must mean ruin. You can not expect young men to remain upon the farm when during a long period of the season, while he is not busy, he must be isolated from his local city or village, from the social centers, on account of the roads which are impassable. Telephone and rural free delivery have been of very material advantage to the farmer, bringing him in closer communication with his local city, but we need to go further and provide some better means of transportation over the roads in the community. Congress appropriates each year millions of dollars for rivers and harbors in the interest of transportation and cheaper freight, which we believe to be beneficial to the people in shipping the products of the farm, mine, and factory; but good roads are just as important to reduce the cost of marketing farm products. It may be said by some that the farmers should build their own roads by taxing their land and personal property. The farmer has always been willing and does bear his just proportion of taxation. His income usually is small, and what he accumulates must be earned by hard work by himself and family. Getting rich upon the farm is a slow process, and but few ever accumulate a large amount of property. Millionaires are not found upon the farm, and yet the produce of the farm supplies a species of speculation after it leaves the farmer's hands, and many times more money and profit is realized from handling the product than the farmer himself receives.

In this country, of course we need better roads to enable the farmer to market his product and to haul what he must buy for use upon the farm back to his home. A system of marketing which will enable him to put his produce upon the market to the best advantage is always a matter of great interest and should be developed so he may reap a just reward for his labor. It is useless for anyone to go out and propose going back to the farm unless he can show that farming conditions are better then when the boy left it. The young man knows under what disadvantages he labored and how he had to travel through the mud and what little profit there was in it to him. In Illinois the State highway commission cooperates with the different counties in the State in reference to road building. The money which is each year appropriated in cooperation with the counties for building roads is a slow process. In many counties material for hard roads must be shipped quite a distance into the State, freight rates are high, and in the end the building of hard roads is so expensive that but little progress has yet been made, so that to-day most of our highways are only dirt roads, which in the winter time with rain, freezing, and thawing, become impassable for hauling of any freight or even traveling in any way. Illinois is a fairly rich State in comparison with others and our lands will compare favorably with most States, and yet our farmers feel that taxation for hard roads would be so great that they hesitate to vote upon themselves and their children this debt, which would be hard to pay, and especially such would be the case if failure of crops come, so in the end they may be greatly in debt and possibly lose their land. It is true that an appropriation of \$25,000,000 is not large when divided up among the States, as proposed by this bill, as it will give only a small amount and will not build very many roads, but it will do some good and will encourage the farmers and show them the Federal Government realizes the importance of these improvements and is willing to aid them in this work.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HULBERT].

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, this bill does not contain any provision from which either the district that I represent or the city of New York, in which it is located, the metropolis of America, derives any direct benefit, yet I am not prepared to say, until I have given this bill further consideration, that we can not benefit indirectly in the same sense that the people of the whole country may benefit by the expenditure of money

for the improvement of the port of New York. [Applause.] I am not provincial in my ideas. Any man who has lived in the city of New York, who has grown up with its commercial progress and advancement, must look to the East, to the West, to the North, and to the South; and the people of my city are as liberal minded as those of any other section of the country. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] said to-day our State had appropriated the sum of \$100,000,000 for good roads, and yet not one dollar of that amount has been nor will ever be expended in the city of New York. We in New York, however, will be called upon by the system of taxation which exists in our State to bear 74 per cent of that \$100,000,000, all of which will be expended outside of the corporate limits of New York City, and in addition to that the people of the city of New York will be called upon in the future, as they have been called upon in the past, to improve, to extend, and to repair the streets and avenues and highways of New York City without any contribution whatever from the people who live outside of the city of New York. If the gentlemen on the other side of the House were equally consistent in their attitude upon good roads at Albany, we would be in more perfect accord.

Gentlemen, the consideration of this matter brings rather to my mind another question upon which I should like to digress for a few moments.

I have sought for a long time to ascertain the real definition and appreciate the application of the words "new project" as applied to legislation adopted by this House. I am constrained to the belief that the bill by which it is sought to appropriate the sum of \$25,000,000 to be expended throughout the rural sections of this country is just as much a matter of a new project as the adoption of a provision for the improvement of the East River and New York Harbor.

I want to direct the attention of Members of this House to the fact that while \$853,000,000 has been appropriated for river and harbor improvements, only \$20,000,000, or less than 3 per cent of that amount, has been expended upon New York Harbor, and yet since 1881 there has been turned into the Federal Treasury from the port of New York \$5,500,000,000, and the city of New York, to say nothing of private interests, has expended \$8 to every \$1 applied by the Federal Government for the development of the greatest harbor in the world and the most productive asset of the United States. In 1868 Congress adopted a project for the improvement of the East River by blasting out certain rocks, which menaced navigation, to a depth of 26 feet. But that was away back, 3 years after the Civil War, 48 years ago. The Government could afford to be liberal with the port of New York then. Up to 1912 about \$6,000,000 was expended, and the project, with its modifications, carried 70 per cent to completion. Then the district Army engineer reported that the commercial necessities had outgrown river development, and recommended an amended project for a 35-foot channel and 30 feet to piers, at a cost of \$33,000,000. The Board of Engineers scaled that down to \$13,400,000, and it was adopted by the House at the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, but stricken out in Senator Burton's filibuster in the Senate. And there we stand to-day. Congress has ceased appropriations upon a project "the further improvement of which is reported as economically inadvisable," but refuses to provide a substitute in the greatest harbor in the world because it is opposed to taking on any "new project." This 35-foot channel from the Battery to Throgs Neck, a distance of only 16 miles, would give us an eastern deep-water entrance from the Atlantic Ocean into New York Bay and would provide New York, what does not exist in any port in the whole world, a double entrance and a double exit to New York Harbor, not only of enormous commercial value, but of strategic importance in the general plan of preparedness—a marine trench for naval purposes, as it were.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DUNN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. HULBERT. Now, Mr. Chairman, the effect of that improvement on the East River to the extent that it has been improved is that during the past year the boats which navigate that stream carried a total commerce of 45,000,000 short tons, having a value of \$1,500,000,000. In addition to which there have been transported on these boats 22,500,000 passengers; and yet because the district engineer has found the expenditure of money under the project of 1868 is economically inadvisable, because we can not induce this Congress to appreciate the necessity of the adoption of the new project recommended by the Chief of Engineers, since 1912 there has not been a dollar expended in the improvement of this great waterway. You talk here of a merchant marine and the building of our pan-American commerce, but I tell you now there are steamship lines having vessels actually in commission and desirous of making New York

the home port, and we have not the docking facilities, because of lack of depth of water to accommodate them. I call attention to the fact that located on the East River is the Brooklyn Navy Yard, where you are building to-day vessels which have a draft of 30 to 31 feet, and yet the channel in the river is only 26 feet. The Secretary of the Navy within the past few days has addressed a letter to this House, which was referred to the Rivers and Harbors Committee, of which I am a member, and I desire to place that letter in the Record without reading it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a letter. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DECEMBER 21, 1915.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to invite your attention to the serious condition existing at the navy yard, Brooklyn, N. Y., in so far as pertains to the depth of water in ship channels leading thereto.

There is not sufficient water in these channels to insure the entering or leaving of a first-class battleship at all times.

At present only one battleship can be handled per day, and then only provided the weather conditions are normal. If the winds are such as to blow the water out of New York Bay then the depth of water in the approach channel is not sufficient to safely navigate a large ship. As an illustration, the following it noted:

On November 3, 1915, the U. S. S. *Texas*, one of our new first-class battleships, was ready to leave the yard, but the prevailing northwest winds had so reduced the depth of water in the Buttermilk Channel that even at high water there was not sufficient depth to insure her leaving the yard in safety. This ship therefore was forced to remain in the navy yard for over 24 hours.

This condition is a serious one and might cause grave complications. I understand there are two propositions before Congress—one providing a channel 35 feet deep and 1,000 feet wide in Buttermilk Channel, and the other north of Governors Island up the East River through Hell Gate. The second would provide for ships passing from the yard to lower New York Bay or to the Sound, a condition highly desirable from a strategic point of view. Either project will provide for free access to the navy yard.

The increase in size of ships has not yet reached its limit. Through injuries received in battle, a ship could readily be drawing more water than normally at a time when it was most necessary to dock her.

It is therefore most urgent that an approach channel to the New York Navy Yard be maintained of not less than 35 feet depth at mean low water and 1,000 feet wide, and I can not too strongly urge the serious attention of Congress to this matter.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

Mr. HULBERT. Now, I want to emphasize another fact. I do not say that there has been any discrimination against New York. I am not going to debate it. As a matter of fact, if any such charge were made, I would leave it to the determination of any unbiased mind.

But I want to call attention to a statement issued by the Post Office Department evidencing the fact that during the year 1914 the post-office receipts in the city of New York were upward of \$29,500,000 and expenditures but \$10,700,000, showing a net profit to the United States Government in the post office of the city of New York of upward of \$18,800,000 to be applied to meet deficiencies in other sections of the country. In other words, the receipts from the city of New York post office were 10½ per cent of the total revenue of the Post Office Department of the whole United States for 1914. In spite of which fact I am called upon by many civic bodies in New York, composed of manufacturers and merchants from the Battery to the uppermost sections of the city, to enter my protest with those of my colleagues against the Postmaster General's proposed action in the great metropolis of America, the greatest in the world, whose postal receipts show a profit of \$18,000,000 a year, by reducing the number of city deliveries in the business sections of that community. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to insert in the Record a letter I received on this subject from the Central Mercantile Association, and my reply, and the resolutions attached thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NEW YORK, January 20, 1916.

Hon. MURRAY HULBERT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Inclosed herewith please find resolution unanimously adopted by our board of directors on the 18th instant, protesting against any reduction in the mail deliveries in the business section of this city.

Would also be pleased to have you present this matter to Chairman Moon, of the Post Office Committee of the House.

Thanking you very kindly for your attention to this matter, beg to remain

Yours, very truly,

CENTRAL MERCANTILE ASSOCIATION,
JOS. E. KEAN, Secretary.

Protest of board of directors and members of Central Mercantile Association against proposed reduction in mail deliveries in New York City.

Whereas it has been brought to our attention through the public press that the House of Representatives Committee on Post Offices, with First Assistant Postmaster General Roper, have under consideration a reduction of the number of mail deliveries in the business districts in this city: Therefore be it

Resolved, That immediate attention be called to the facts and conditions existing as to the total revenue of New York post office, which was upward of \$29,500,000 in the year 1914; the total expenses of the New York post office for the year 1914 were about \$10,700,000, showing a net profit to the United States Government of upward of \$18,800,000 for this particular year. That the total revenues of the New York post office were over 10½ per cent of the total revenues of the Post Office Department for the whole United States for the year 1914.

Resolved further, That the board of directors of the Central Mercantile Association (comprising the great majority of the larger manufacturing, wholesale, and retail firms and real-property owners between Canal Street and Thirty-fourth Street, Fourth Avenue and North River) vigorously protest against any reduction in the number of mail deliveries daily in the business section of the city of New York, because it would result in much delay and great detriment to and seriously retard the daily mail-order business which is transacted by practically all manufacturing, wholesale, and jobbing houses in this city with business firms in all other towns and cities: Be it further

Resolved, That because of the vast volume of business done by mail order, that any reduction in mail delivery would necessarily result in a reduction of the postal revenue at the New York post office and likewise retard the general business of parcel-post delivery: And be it further

Resolved, That the President be urged to appoint a special committee to take the matter up and present such facts as may be necessary to the Post Office Department and to the Members of Congress in regard to the mail deliveries in New York City.

NEW YORK CITY, January 18, 1916.

NEW YORK BOARD OF TRADE AND TRANSPORTATION,
New York, January 12, 1916.

Protest against proposed reduction in mail deliveries in New York City unanimously adopted by the New York Board of Trade and Transportation.

Whereas it is reported that the House of Representatives Committee on Post Offices, with First Assistant Postmaster General Roper, have under consideration a curtailment of the number of mail deliveries in the business districts in this city: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we invite attention to the facts that the total revenue of the New York post office was \$29,488,518.02 in the year 1914; that the total expenses of the New York post office for the year 1914 were \$10,686,996.28; that the New York post office, therefore, produced a net profit to the United States Government of \$18,801,521.74 for the year 1914; that the total revenues of the New York post office were over 10½ per cent of the total revenues of the Post Office Department for the whole United States for the year 1914;

Resolved, That we protest against any curtailment of the number of mail deliveries daily in the business sections of the city of New York, because it would result in delaying delivery of all mail from all parts of the country destined for New York business houses and injure the merchants and buyers in all other cities and places, and we further protest because experience in the New York post office shows that mail coming for delivery in this city is so vast in volume that any curtailment of the number of deliveries would cause an accumulation so great as to necessitate the employment of a larger number of carriers to enable them to make delivery on a reduced number of deliveries, and would thus cause an increase of expense instead of a reduction thereof;

Resolved, That the president be authorized to appoint a special committee to make proper representation of the facts to the Post Office Department and Members of Congress in regard to the mail deliveries in New York.

A true copy.

Attest:

S. V. V. HUNTINGTON, President.

FRANK S. GARDNER, Secretary.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BRITT].

Mr. BRITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support, in a few words, the pending bill. I chance to be the farthest south Republican Member of this body in the eastern section of the United States, and yet I most heartily and gladly join with the Democratic chairman of the Committee on Roads in support of this bill, for the reason that I believe it to be founded on certain great essential and necessary principles. I think the bill meets many conditions which should be met, and should be met now. It has been said on this floor to-day that it was a discrimination in favor of the country and against the city. Such has been the substantial import of certain arguments. Can it be that gentlemen will come here and advocate the construction, at great expense, of splendid post-office buildings in our cities and towns, and yet hold that it is unconstitutional and impolitic to expend a dollar to make a post road along which the mail may be carried from that office to the man who chances to live in the country? I think the bill gives a splendid definition of the term post roads. It applies it to all of the country and to all of the towns, boroughs, and cities of less than 2,000 population, and it makes it apply to cities of more than 2,000 population if the houses chance to be upon an average of more than 200 feet apart. I think the distribution of the money is splendidly made and upon a most excellent and sound basis. In the first place, it recognizes the individual sovereignty of the States after the analogy of the apportionment of Senators in Congress, by giving the little States, such as Delaware and Rhode Island, \$65,000

to start with, just as is given to the States of New York and Texas. In the next place, it recognizes the proportionate population of the States by the last decennial census, giving to each State one-half the remainder upon the ratio which the population of the State bears to the population of the whole country. It then apportions the remainder according to the relative mileage of rural routes and star routes in each State, an easily ascertainable fact.

When the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] referred to the Cumberland Road, he stopped short of telling this House that it was because of the construction of that road, and because of the Federal aid which constructed it, that the great section of the country in which he lives and which he represents had its development in the opening up of that wonderful country in the impetus given immigration by the construction of this road.

I live in a district which is rural and mountainous. I live in a State in which we as a State, as counties, as municipalities and townships, have done and are doing all that our resources will permit us to do in the way of construction of highways. We can not do all that should be done in a large district like mine, a district of a quarter of a million people, comprising 13 counties, a mountainous section, with rivers and valleys and deep gorges. We need the assistance which the Federal Government has given to hundreds and hundreds of less meritorious things. Can it be that since 1878 we have expended \$650,000,000 to improve the rivers and harbors, not a penny of which has come directly to the benefit of the people of the district which I have the honor to represent, and yet that not a dollar, as some gentlemen say, be used to construct and maintain a road, perchance, to go out of the city into the rural sections? Can it be that we have given 197,000,000 acres of our western lands toward the construction of railroads as a great public subvention, and yet that we should not give to the rural sections a dollar in order that they may have better roads over which to carry the mails, over which to carry their produce, and better roads over which their children may go to school? Can it be that we may spend \$500,000,000 upon the construction of the Panama Canal—for that is what it will amount to before it is completed, and I approve it most heartily, although it is thousands of miles from us—and yet it will be unconstitutional and impolitic to expend any money to construct highways upon which the rural citizens, the plain farmers, out in God's own free country, where men do their best work and think their purest thoughts and act their noblest parts, that it is unconstitutional and impolitic to spend a dollar for the construction of these roads? [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, this is not only a sound principle, it is a necessary measure. I urge it here to-day because the country people, who will be most largely benefited, have not received their just proportion of the distribution of public moneys by the Federal Government in its various governmental activities. Where are the large, costly buildings constructed for the Government? In the cities—and I am not against the cities. Where are the millions of dollars expended to dredge and clean the harbors in order that our ships may come in and go out with safety and facility? It is about the cities of the country. Where have the great expenditures been made for so many different public enterprises? They have been made most largely in and about the cities; and now the chairman of the Committee on Roads comes here with a bill which I think is a splendid bill in almost every particular and asks that rural routes and star routes and farmers' roads may be improved. Can we find a valid objection in all that has been stated? Not one. Some things said here to-day in opposition to this bill, to my mind, have been amusing rather than logical. Let me say once more it has been said that this is the entering wedge and that lavish expenditure will follow. It is said that we are building a road out to the farmer's house. Why, if that is the effect of it, what is it in the way of evil? If it should carry the road out into the country, out into the rural sections and past the farmer's house and result in a benefit to him and his family, is he not entitled to this as much as our sons and daughters are entitled to look upon splendid Government buildings in the cities? I live in a city myself. Are they not entitled to have some of the results of appropriative moneys of the Federal Government, even if it does not please the fancy of those gentlemen who chance to have no rural interests whatever in their districts?

The section in which I live has made great strides in road building. It can not do all that should be done. Over our mountains and up our hills and across our valleys we are laying out, constructing, and maintaining splendid roads, but we can not do it all. Gentlemen, those hills are as beautiful as God ever permitted man to look upon, and I could wish my colleagues no

greater pleasure than to have them come at a time when the season is at its best and take an eyeful of the beauties of the mountains and valleys of my district. I am not asking for North Carolina anything to which she is not entitled as a part of the great policy which this Government has followed from the beginning in giving aid wherever wisdom and necessity have dictated that it should be given. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRITT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRITT. Mr. Chairman, one of the most vital questions which confronts the American people to-day is that of improving their public highways. This problem has been, up to the present, left by the National Government to be solved by the several States and their local political subdivisions in such manner as they may best be able. While this is a great burden for the States and smaller subdivisions to bear and while the interstate nature of many of these public roads and of present day traffic would seem to impose a part, at least, of this burden upon the National Government, yet these States and smaller subdivisions are assuming this burden in a manner becoming a great people, and great strides are being made in the direction of its solution. Evidence of this is afforded by the progress actually attained. The first authentic road census in this country was taken by the Office of Public Roads of the United States Department of Agriculture in the year 1904. This census disclosed the fact that we had a road mileage aggregating about 2,150,000, of which about 153,000 miles were improved. Our annual expenditure for road purposes that year amounted to about \$80,000,000. In 1909 a second census was taken. This second census showed that during the five-year period the mileage of improved roads had increased to about 190,000, or nearly 25 per cent. The expenditures for that year were not obtained, but, according to figures recently compiled in the Office of Public Roads, the road expenditures for 1915 approximate the enormous sum of \$200,000,000.

From these facts it is evident that the States and their minor subdivisions are putting forth a supreme effort to improve their highway conditions. It is apparent that they recognize the importance of this improvement and regard it of such pressing need that they are willing to spend their money and their energy in its accomplishment. This spirit of progressiveness should be commended. Not only should it be commended, but it should be rewarded by the National Government joining hands with the States and, through a spirit of wholesome cooperation and substantial money aid, assisting them in furthering the development of a better system of highways throughout this entire country.

Nearly every progressive undertaking looking to the advancement of our civilization is receiving some measure of aid or encouragement from our National Government. Laws have been enacted for the purpose of stimulating efforts in literature, the useful arts and inventions by a system of liberal copyrights, trade-marks, and patents. Annual contribution is made to the education of the youth of every State in the Union. Over \$650,000,000 have been expended for the improvement of our rivers and harbors, and lighthouses and danger signals are maintained along all navigable waters to safeguard their commerce. Donations of public lands, aggregating 197,000,000 acres, have been made for the purpose of promoting railroad development throughout the country, and at present the Interstate Commerce Commission is maintained to prevent the railroads from charging excessive rates for transportation. The United States Department of Agriculture, with its corps of well-trained scientists, is engaged in trying to teach the farmers of the country to adopt better methods of farming so as to increase their annual production, which has already reached the \$10,000,000,000 mark. But with all this, as broad as may seem the activities of our National Government, and as liberal as may be its appropriations, it has not yet joined hands with the people in aid of the improvement of our highways which are so vital to the welfare of our entire population, and particularly our rural population.

Consider for a moment the relative importance, as great national economic factors, of our farms and cities. Has it ever occurred to you that the American farm is the greatest known wealth producer, and that our cities are almost equally famous as wealth consumers? Such is, nevertheless, the case. Primarily, every city resident may be said to produce nothing. He is merely engaged in the consumption, distribution, or manipulation of that which is produced elsewhere, chiefly on the farm. On the other hand, every inhabitant of the farm may be said to be a producer, large or small, the value of their combined annual production exceeding the sum of \$10,000,000,000.

Not only this, but a large per cent of the aggregate wealth of the United States is represented by farm property. Our total wealth at present is placed at about \$150,000,000,000. Of this, more than \$50,000,000,000, or about one-third, consists of farm property. The yearly return on this investment in farm property is represented by our ten billions of annual farm production, which is about 22.5 per cent of the money invested. There is scarcely another class of property in existence which yields such satisfactory returns or plays so important a part in our commercial and industrial development. This readily appears from the fact that in 1910 our exports of farm products, exclusive of forest products, amounted to \$871,158,425, or 50.9 per cent of all domestic exports, while our imports of farm products amounted to \$687,509,115, or only 44.2 per cent of the total imports, leaving in our favor a balance of \$183,649,310.

But this vast wealth of farm products must be hauled over our public roads before reaching the channels of trade and commerce. It must be transported an average distance of about 9.4 miles before being served up as food for our city population or to provide raw material for running our manufacturing or to swell the volume of our foreign commerce. It would seem, therefore, a duty of the National Government to help improve the highways over which these products must be hauled and thus facilitate their reaching the markets for further distribution. Exceeding care is taken and vast sums of money expended by the Federal Government to improve the channels of transportation through which they must pass after being removed from the farms. To promote this purpose donations of public lands aggregating 197,000,000 acres were made to the railroads; since 1875 more than \$650,000,000 have been appropriated from our National Treasury for the improvement of our rivers and harbors; and the mammoth project of all ages is now being prosecuted in Panama, where approximately \$500,000,000 is being expended in constructing the Panama Canal, to afford a shorter route between the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts and to facilitate the commerce of the world generally.

No objection is raised to these appropriations for the purposes named. Every one of them is a worthy project and deserves not only the aid which is being extended by the Government, but should command the hearty support and indorsement of every public-spirited American citizen. However, if there are other projects of similar merit or equally essential to our public welfare they should receive equally as favorable consideration at the hands of the Government. An instance in point is the improvement of our public roads. It seems inconsistent on the part of our Government for it to expend such vast sums in improving our rivers and harbors and digging the Panama Canal in order to facilitate the handling of our commerce, and then not to take an equal interest in the improvement of the highways over which more than 50 per cent of the products which enter into this commerce must first pass. The originator of this vast volume of commerce deserves some measure of consideration.

Another fact worthy of note in this connection is that the Government has expended nearly a quarter billion in the erection of public buildings in the towns and cities throughout the United States for the convenience of our city population. This was a large and necessary expenditure, yet its benefits only reach the approximate 47 per cent of our population living in the cities. Is it any more a duty of the Government to erect buildings in the cities to accommodate their population and add to their architectural beauty than it is to help build roads over which our farmers may haul their produce with ease and profit and thus enable them to improve their farms and build more attractive homes to beautify the roadsides? It has been well said:

Tear down every edifice in our cities and labor will rebuild them, but abandon our farms and highways and our cities will disappear forever.

The necessity for this line of work was early recognized by the passage in 1806 of an act of Congress providing an appropriation for the construction of a great national highway from Cumberland, Md., westward. Appropriations of this character continued for a number of years, finally ceasing after reaching a total of \$14,000,000. At the time these appropriations were made they represented a larger proportion of the then total wealth of the United States than would similar appropriations to-day aggregating \$613,000,000, which is the total cost of the great French system of highways. The census of 1850, 12 years after the last appropriation for the old Cumberland Road, placed the total wealth of the United States at \$7,135,780,228, which is less than the present annual value of our farm products. It would seem, therefore, if such appropriations could be made at a time when the national exchequer was at such a

low ebb, with the same principle and even greater reasons therefor now existing, that our National Government should no longer delay extending substantial aid to the cause of better roads.

Not only does it seem that these appropriations might be made, but they have been made within recent years. Not, however, for expenditure within our own territory, nor for the benefit of our citizenship, but to build roads in foreign territory. Since the War with Spain, and prior to the year 1913, there had been expended from our National Treasury for road building in Alaska \$1,925,000; in Porto Rico, \$2,000,000; and in the Philippine Islands, \$3,000,000; making a total of \$6,925,000 thus appropriated for building roads outside of the continental United States. The total of all appropriations for the Old Cumberland Road was only \$6,824,919.33, so that more has been expended in recent years in these foreign possessions than was formerly spent on our famous old national pike.

Many protest against the constitutionality of national aid. Even among some Members of Congress, a pronounced doubt seems to exist as to the constitutional authority for making such appropriations of public funds. But does it seem any more appropriate or a more rigid adherence to the spirit and letter of the Constitution for our Government to make such appropriations for the benefit of an alien population than for its own citizens? There is a very wise old saying that "Charity should begin at home," and it seems eminently applicable in this connection.

The Constitution is an instrument which we all revere. It has proven an anchor of safety in many a crisis, and if our ship of state shall always be steered in obedience to its mandates, our Republic will endure unto the end of time. We would not have a single clause or principle of that great instrument perverted, even if the doors of the Treasury would thereby be opened for the much-needed improvement of our highways. It is believed, however, that ample authority exists for Federal aid without the slightest warping of the Constitution. Paragraphs 1, 3, and 7, respectively, of section 8, Article I, provides as follows:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes.

To establish post offices and post roads.

Either of the foregoing paragraphs is sufficiently broad to afford Congress ample authority to make appropriations for highway purposes. The "general welfare" clause, in paragraph 1, has often been invoked as authority for various kinds of internal improvements. But the question may be asked what constitutes an internal improvement? Well, in answer, it may be defined as an undertaking, promotive of the public welfare, but of such magnitude as to defy individual effort.

The power of Congress to make appropriations for this class of improvements received considerable attention at the hands of Congress at an early date. In a speech in the United States Senate in 1830, Daniel Webster referred to this power of the Government, in part, as follows:

Under this view of things, I thought it necessary to settle, at least for myself, some definite notions with respect to the powers of the Government in regard to internal affairs, and I arrived at the conclusion that the Government had power to accomplish sundry objects or aid in their accomplishment.

The improvements of our rivers and harbors is an internal improvement on which the Government is now making lavish expenditures. In the early history of our country appropriations for roads and for rivers and harbors were classed together. The veto messages of Presidents Madison, Monroe, Jackson, and Pierce urged the same constitutional objections against appropriations for rivers and harbors as for highways. The principle involved in these two lines of work has not changed, nor have the clauses of the Constitution which authorize them been amended.

It may be claimed that river and harbor improvements, in addition to the "general-welfare" clause, find authority under the clause of the Constitution conferring upon Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States * * *," which seems inapplicable to roads. Assuming that the authority is derived from this clause, is it not also applicable to roads? In the first place, what is commerce? Webster's Dictionary defined it as "the exchange or buying and selling of commodities." If, therefore, I live on a farm 10 miles from the market, railroad station, or wharf and have \$1,000 worth of produce which I wish to dispose of, at what time does that produce enter the realm of commerce? Is it when I load my wagon and drive away from the farm with it, or is it not until I shall have delivered it at the market, rail-

road station, or wharf? Logically my produce would be just as much articles of commerce while in transit from my farm to the point of delivery as after reaching there, and the public highway over which I might perform the haul would be just as much a route of commercial transportation as the railroads or rivers and harbors which might handle it afterwards.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, there originated along the lines of our railroads 968,464,009 tons of freight. Did the constituent commodities which entered into this freight not become articles of commerce before delivery at the railroad station? During 1910 our exports exceeded \$1,700,000,000, of which 50.9 per cent was farm products, exclusive of forest products. Did the commodities represented by this vast sum not become articles of commerce until they reached the wharf for foreign shipment? Manifestly such is not the case. A commodity produced for commercial purposes becomes an article of commerce at the place of production, and it enters the channels of commerce the moment it is sold or exchanged or started in transit for sale or exchange. The vast tonnage of our railroad and water transportation routes consist largely of farm and other products originating away from the station or wharf, the initial haul being over our public roads. Therefore our public roads have just about as strong a claim on the Government, under the commerce clause of the Constitution, as do our rivers and harbors.

However, there is yet another clause of the Constitution which affords Congress this power more clearly than either of the foregoing. This is the clause conferring the power "to establish post offices and post roads." The authority granted by this clause is specific, and, inasmuch as the Government uses the public roads every day in the transportation of the mails, it would seem proper and timely for the exercise of this power. The rural delivery of mails is made each day over the public highways, the average number of miles traveled daily by rural carriers exceeding 1,000,000, or nearly one-half of all roads in the United States. Being a daily user of almost one-half of all our public roads, and the condition of these roads being so vital to efficiency and economy in the administration of the Rural Delivery Service, it would seem that the Government should take a hand in the improvement of these roads.

No country has good roads except where the general government has shared the responsibility of building and maintaining them. All of the European countries which have improved roads have acquired them under a system whereby their National Governments have borne a part of the cost and assisted in the supervision of their construction and maintenance. France is recognized as having the finest roads of any country in the world, but in the building of these roads the National Government of France contributed over \$600,000,000, and supervises their maintenance to-day. Road conditions in some of the more progressive European countries are worthy of mention:

FRANCE.

France has an area of 207,054 square miles, a population (1901) of 38,962,000, and the total mileage of all public roads is 516,000 miles. This gives practically 2½ miles of road for every square mile of area and 75 people per mile of road. As compared with the United States, we have 2,200,000 miles of road, which gives an average of 0.74 mile of road per square mile of area, and a population of 41 per mile of road. On the other hand, Massachusetts has 2.15 miles of road per square mile of area and a population of 195 per mile, while Ohio has 2.18 miles of road per square mile of area and a population of 54 per mile of road.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The movement in England since 1878 has been toward the consolidation and enlargement of highway districts and the powers of the supervising officials. The first step in this movement really began in 1835, through an act of Parliament which gathered all existing statutes into one law and added certain clauses, among which was a permissive clause whereby several parishes could join together for road-administration purposes. In 1862 the highway district act was passed, which provided for the formation of highway districts consisting of several parishes and controlled by a highway board. The act was amended in minor detail in 1864.

The next act was the highway and locomotive (amendment) act of 1878. This provided for a more workable district and central authority, and provided for taking over the disarranged roads. One-half of the cost of main road maintenance was borne by the county and one-half by districts and parishes. Ten years later (1888) the local government act threw the care of all main roads on the county councils and abolished the old highway boards.

The last act of epoch-making importance is the development and road improvement funds act, 1909, which provides for a road board, the members to be appointed by the treasury. The board has power, with approval of the treasury, to make advances to the county councils and other highway authorities in respect to construction of new roads and the improvement of old ones. The advances may be either in form of grant or loan. The revenues are to be raised from licenses on motor vehicles and certain licenses and excises on the sale, manufacture, and import of petrol (gasoline).

SWITZERLAND.

In general, the public roads in Switzerland are divided into two main classes—cantonal roads, sometimes called State roads, and local, or communal roads. With the exception of a few intermountain and other roads of national importance, over which the National Government

exercises a supervision, the cantonal roads are controlled entirely by the Cantons. The Federal supervision of these roads of national importance is largely limited to the voting of annual indemnities to the four Cantons of Grison, Tessin, Uri, and Valais, which total about \$103,000. If the special roads are not maintained in proper condition the Federal funds are withheld. The cantonal roads are generally placed under the direct charge of a highway department. Construction and maintenance are entirely supervised by this authority, while the funds are voted by cantonal government, usually under the budget system. In the new construction it is very customary for the Canton to pay a portion of the cost, while the remainder is assessed on the commune or parish. In the Canton of Vaud the proportion is 70 per cent by the State and 30 per cent by the commune. The Canton of Berne pays from 25 to 70 per cent, according to the financial condition of the commune, while the Canton of Tessin requires all new construction to be paid in full by the communes traversed. The maintenance of the cantonal roads, on the other hand, is in general, all borne by the Canton. A few Cantons require the respective communes to transport the necessary road materials from the pits or quarries to the road.

The maintenance of the cantonal or State roads is by roadmen employed throughout the year, as in France and Germany. The average length of section assigned to each man is about 3 miles. The annual salary of the cantonniers, or roadmen, varies from \$150 to \$200. In some Cantons the road men are also allowed the hay and pasturage along the roadside. Trees are only occasionally planted along the roadsides.

SWEDEN.

In Sweden every county is a separate community with regard to the construction and maintenance of public roads, bridges, and ferries. The county government board, appointed by the Crown, superintends the proper maintenance of the roads and bridges within the county. The orders of this board are executed by a superior sheriff (Kronofogde), deputy sheriffs (Länsmän), and assistant sheriffs (Fjerdingsmän).

The roads of the county are inspected once a year by a board consisting of the deputy sheriff and two jurors. A schedule for the inspection tour is published in advance and full records are kept of the inspection. A full report is made to the road board, and such road maintainers or road managers as are found to have defective road sections are notified, with detailed instructions of the necessary repairs. If these are not made within a specified time, fines are imposed, and the deputy sheriff may also have the work done and charge the expense to the road managers.

Until 1891 road maintenance was almost entirely "in natura," that is, by the owners or tillers of the soil. Now an additional revenue is raised from other taxable property than land, which constitutes a so-called "road fund."

The roads are divided into road districts, which are in turn divided into allotments to be maintained "in natura." These allotments are changed from time to time by the county government, but only on substantial evidence showing the need of such change. The road fund is distributed to the various allotments and for the district in general in a somewhat complicated manner by a board or committee in which both the county and district have a voice.

The Royal Board of Road Building and Water Works (Kongl. Vag-Och Vattenbyggnadstyrelsen) has supervisory and advisory powers in matters concerning road construction, railroads, harbors, etc. This board is composed of officers who, besides being graduates in their departments at the Technical High School, have also passed a military course in the fortification corps in the army.

In maintenance the Federal Government contributes to the road fund a sum equal to 15 per cent of the total cost, while in new construction the Government pays two-thirds and the road district one-third. The method of handling the funds and carrying out the work of construction is very similar to that already described for maintenance.

Great progress is being made in this country in the work of road improvement through the efforts of the States and local governmental units, but the progress being attained is not as great as the importance of this question should justify. In order to accelerate this progress our National Government, following the example set by the national Governments of the progressive European countries, should lend its aid. Agitation looking to this end has been going on for a number of years, and a strong sentiment exists throughout the country in favor of such action. Not only this, but the number of bills which have been introduced in both Houses of Congress providing for some system of national aid indicates that a strong sentiment exists in Congress for participation in this work. Therefore it behooves this Congress to take some definite action looking to this end as soon as a definite and wise policy can be agreed upon.

For my own part, I think that the form of national aid which should be adopted should be of such character as will bring about a wholesome cooperation between the National, State, and local governments. In order to facilitate the administration of such a measure, the State should be the smallest unit with which the National Government would deal; but I think that through the State local government units should be included and required to share in the expense and responsibility incident to the carrying forward of the work. To this end, some scheme whereby there would be an equal division of cost between the National, the State, and the local governmental units should be adopted.

To my mind, the bill which most nearly embodies this idea among those which have been introduced in Congress is House bill 7617. This bill provides for an annual appropriation of \$25,000,000, to be distributed among the different States on the basis of State units, population, and mileage of star and rural delivery routes. Under the provisions of this bill \$65,000 would be distributed to each of the several States, one-half of the remainder to each State in the ratio which its population shall bear to the total population of the United States and the remain-

ing one-half among the States at the ratio which the mileage of star routes and rural delivery routes in each State shall bear to the total mileage of star routes and rural delivery routes in the United States.

This bill also makes the State the smallest unit with which the National Government would deal, dealings with the smaller units to be by the State authorities. The administration of the bill, so far as the National Government is concerned, is vested in the Department of Agriculture.

This department has done a great work in developing the widespread sentiment for better highways which now exists and has an efficient organization which can and should be utilized to further advantage by vesting in it the administration of such legislation as Congress may enact for the participation of the National Government in highway work. This is provided for in House bill 7617.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly hope the pending bill will receive the approval of this House.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. HERNANDEZ].

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in the few minutes that have been allotted to me I will not undertake to discuss this measure with the very eloquent men who have taken part in this discussion. I will content myself, however, in saying that I am heartily in favor of it, because I think, as has been said here, it is a beneficial piece of legislation for the people at large. We are legislating here for all the people. I heard the word "paternalism" used in connection with this measure. As I understand the word "paternalism," it means paternal aid to any community. Some of these gentlemen are laboring under the apprehension they are going to build roads for the farmers of the West or the Southwest or the Middle States. This apprehension, Mr. Chairman, is a very small one when you go and compare it with the amounts that the various States have already appropriated and are spending upon their public roads. Why, the small State of New Mexico is spending to-day at the rate of \$1,000,000 a year on its public highways. We have constructed between 300 and 400 miles of roads in the last year. When they think they will not profit by means of these roads they are mistaken. Why, I have seen people traveling in automobiles from here down to the Pacific coast. I happened to be down there last winter and I saw people from Buffalo, N. Y., down on the coast who had gone across all of those States and across the States of New Mexico and Arizona. Everybody is benefited by good roads. Our last legislature in New Mexico made an appropriation, or, rather, approved the issue of half a million dollars in bonds for the purpose of good-roads construction. According to the terms of this bill we will get \$155,000 out of the amount appropriated.

If this measure is enacted into law, it will be thankfully received, and the money will be properly used. I will also say here that in my State we are properly equipped. We have a State roads commission, composed of our governor, the commissioner of public lands, and of our State engineer, and they are an efficient board, who will see to it that these funds are not used on some cow trail or anything of that sort; and I am sure that the majority of the Members of this House have the same confidence that I have in the integrity and efficiency of their public officials. Let us be charitable and have confidence in a public official until he proves that he is unworthy of that confidence. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask permission to have my further remarks extended in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, in speaking of the roads and the improvements that are being made, I would like to show within the few minutes allotted to me the conditions of the highway department in New Mexico and what they have done toward the betterment of roads in my State.

The Thirty-sixth Legislative Assembly of New Mexico, recognizing the importance to the entire public of good roads and permanent road building, established a public highway known as El Camino Real, to traverse the most important counties from the border of Colorado at Raton, Colfax County, to the Texas border south of Las Cruces, in Dona Ana County, and while still a Territory attempted some improvement on the line of roads for the purpose of a main highway, but prior to 1912 no great progress had been made in improving the possibilities of traffic from county to county. Until New Mexico acquired the dignity of statehood the lack of funds and any central or State organization prevented effective work. Since 1912 the progress has been marked, and so great is the appreciation of

the work being done that the State, county, and precinct authorities are now working in complete harmony to the great advantage of the entire State.

New Mexico has more to contend with than most States of the Union in constructing and maintaining roads.

It has an area larger than many of the States more densely populated. Its populated areas are far apart; its available funds smaller than any other State in proportion to the miles of road necessary to afford proper facilities for overland transportations; its rainfall torrential at times and destructive to the very best road construction; its geological conditions so varied as to present innumerable problems of construction and maintenance; good road materials are not always available within any reasonable distance, and cost prevents the consideration of imported materials; long stretches of deep sand, miles of heavy rock work, valleys, mountains, table lands, precipitation varying from 8 to 30 inches, and watercourses as uncertain as the floating clouds, all make the work of good road building both difficult and expensive; but the people of New Mexico have worked with the determination to succeed, and it is not too much to claim that for its population, taxable wealth, and mileage New Mexico is fully abreast with the most progressive State in the Union.

In my State there are now 4,000 miles of main State and intercounty highways, and there was expended on these roads in 1915, \$550,000. In 1915 there were 350 miles of new roads constructed, and there will be expended upon the State and county roads in 1916 the sum of \$1,250,000, and I estimate that about 700 miles more road will be built this year.

The Forest Service has also very substantially assisted in the building of roads in my State.

During the year 1915 from the 25 per cent of the gross receipts earned by the Forest Service the road fund, or rather the highway commission, received from the Forest Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, the sum of \$16,871.75; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, there is available for the highway commission for the year 1916 the sum of \$15,893.23.

For roads and trails and for the benefit of the public there is a further 10 per cent added, which, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and available in 1915, amounted to \$13,497.40, and for the current year there will be available for the same purpose the sum of \$12,714.58.

In giving you these figures I am trying to show you that the people of New Mexico have not been idle, but have done as much for the benefit of their roads and the public at large as any of the more populous States with very much more money to handle the great work than New Mexico has ever had.

The \$65,000, being the specific amount to be turned over to the State, will not go very far in the great work that we are doing, but if we should be entitled to the total amount of aid, namely, \$155,802, as proposed in the bill, our State will prove to you that the work that we can and will accomplish will be equal to that done by any other State in the Union.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, of course this is a very elaborate question. It is a very interesting question, and it is also a very important question. I have listened with much interest to the various Members as they have given their views upon the subject, and the first one that meets my view is the division of this \$25,000,000. Some think a more equitable distribution could be made of this money. I will fully explain my position on that feature of the bill under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, this bill undertakes to aid the States in the construction of its public highways. It appropriates the sum of \$25,000,000, from which amount \$65,000 is to be paid in bulk to each State, large or small. The balance is then divided into two portions. One portion is to be distributed among all the States according to their population and the other portion is to be divided among all the States according to the number of miles of the highways used for mail delivery and star-route roads. In this estimate the population of Michigan is fixed at 2,810,173, and the number of miles of highway in Michigan for this allotment is fixed at 46,236 miles. The amount of Federal aid apportioned to Michigan under this bill is estimated at \$850,492. Before this amount is available, however, a like sum must be used by the State in the construction of its public highways. The class of roads that may participate in this appropriation includes earth, sand-clay, sand-gravel, and

other common types of roads, as well as roads of higher classes, one of the purposes of the act being to encourage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into the adjacent farming community.

The roads are to be constructed under the supervision of the State highway department of the State wherein the road is constructed, and reports of the character of the highway and its completion are to be made to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States. This money may also be used for the maintenance of the highway as well as for its construction, and the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, from time to time make payments upon the construction or maintenance as the same progresses, but not, however, exceeding the prorata part to be paid by the United States for the value of labor and material put into such construction and maintenance. The work is to be carried on under the supervision of the State highway commissioner, who reports to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and all payments of money shall be made by the Treasurer of the United States upon the warrant of the Secretary of Agriculture.

EQUITABLE DIVISION OF THE FUND.

It is thought by some that making a payment of \$65,000 flat equally to each State is not just. That the State of Rhode Island, with a population of a little over half a million and about 1,000 miles of highway, ought not to receive \$65,000 of the appropriation, while New York, with a population of over 10,000,000 and over 48,000 miles of highway, is to receive only a like amount. While this amount was fixed arbitrarily by the committee, I think that the distribution of this equal amount can not be regarded as wholly unfair. A mile of highway in one State costs as much to construct and maintain as a mile of highway in any other State. It is as useful and beneficial and serviceable in one State as in another. This \$65,000 apportioned to each State will construct possibly 5 miles of highway or less, and there is no State that can not use this amount in the construction of its highways to good advantage. Indeed, the amount of appropriation to each State under this act can be profitably utilized in the maintenance of the highways in all the States.

THIS MONEY WILL BE WELL EXPENDED.

We spent \$400,000,000 for the construction of the Panama Canal, largely in the interest of commerce and transportation. When our country was new millions of acres of our choicest farming land, now of great value, were donated to the construction of railroads, canals, and highways in the interest of commerce and transportation and the general welfare of the Republic. Large appropriations are made annually for the construction of imposing Federal buildings throughout the land, and for the improvement of rivers and harbors in the interest of commerce and transportation, but the commerce of the entire country starts in the rural sections and from the farm, and no more beneficial appropriation, whether in the interest of commerce or the welfare and prosperity of the people, can be made than a reasonable appropriation for public highways.

MERCHANT MARINE.

Much is being said now about the desirability, the benefit, and the need of a merchant marine. We are all in favor of an American merchant marine to aid in our commerce, and surely it would be of great benefit to the industries of our country, whether that industry be of manufacturing or that of the farm. Our country's welfare depends upon agriculture, manufacturing, and commerce. The products of the soil are estimated at \$9,000,000,000 annually. This is stated as their value at the farm, while the estimate is made that the cost to the consumer of these products is \$27,000,000,000. Largely entering into the increased cost of farm products is the cost of transportation, and I was interested yesterday in the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE], when he states that the cost of transportation per ton-mile of these products from the farm to the market was practically 23 cents on poor roads, while a ton could be moved a mile on good roads for one-third of this amount, or about 7 cents per mile per ton. When we consider that the products of the farm run up into the billions of tons per annum it is easy to see the vast saving good roads are to the farmer, the loss being estimated at \$228,000,000. May I say that but for agriculture our country would, indeed, be in a most deplorable, wretched, and impoverished condition. Let each farmer sit down and estimate the number of tons he markets each year, and the distance from his farm to the market, and what the saving would amount to each year if he could draw his products for 7 cents per mile per ton instead of it costing him 23 cents per ton a mile, and he will readily see the profit in good roads.

GOOD ROADS ARE FAVORED BY ALL THE PEOPLE.

The most important attribute of the State or Nation is its highways. The early highways of the States were its first concern. Without highways our rural communities would be practically shut off not only from the markets, but from civilization as well.

The highways were first constructed by the woodsmen, by those living in rural communities and with taxes levied on county, township, and farms. The hardy pioneer settlers cleared the country, beautified it by their handiwork, erected the country's schoolhouses, churches, and left an enduring monument of their handiwork in the construction of a network of highways which make accessible the remote parts of our country. They are gone, but these monuments remain for our use, our benefit, and our comfort. The welfare, prosperity, and happiness of all the people, not alone for those living in the country or the city or the villages, but for the people as a whole. Times have changed along with conditions. To-day the automobile has transplanted the horse on the highway and motor power is fast taking his place in doing the drawing and hauling. These advances are calling for better highways and are being met with a hearty response by the people in the country and cities. In fact, a person is hardly called an up-to-date farmer if he does not now have an automobile with which in a few minutes or hours at the furthest he can go to town, secure repairs for his machinery, do his trading or banking, and return. At first there was a strong prejudice against the auto by the farmer. They frightened his teams, he saw them used only by those having leisure on their hands and largely for pleasure. He could see that they cut up and destroyed his dirt highways. And it was not believed by him that they would ever become a necessary utility for carrying on his business. But with the coming of the Ford this has all changed. Every farmer now has his auto. This he uses for commercial business as well as for pleasure. The auto has passed from the stage of luxury to that of necessity. But with the small car has also come the great 60-horsepower passenger. Most will admit that the larger cars are owned in the city. Most will admit that the larger cars are the most severe on the highways.

There is no question but that it takes a good highway to stand up under the larger cars of to-day, and a dirt highway in wet weather is soon cut up and greatly injured by them. Most people living in the city use their cars for country travel, and I think they are willing, without complaint, to help construct and maintain country highways and will be in favor of Federal aid for the construction and maintenance of better roads. The estimated wealth of the United States is \$150,000,000,000. No one would care to figure out the infinitesimal part this appropriation of \$25,000,000 bears to that great sum. The wealth, the progress, and the prosperity of our country is so dependent upon our public highways that to deny the one is but to injure the other.

WASHINGTON CITY.

Who is there of you, my colleagues, who did not when he first came to this beautiful city of Washington, our National Capital, thrill with pride on seeing its beautiful public buildings, magnificent parks, and fine statues of our great men? But am I wrong in saying that you were equally or more impressed by its splendidly constructed streets and pavements? They are smooth as the typical barn floor and radiate in all directions and into every quarter of the city. They are permanently built of asphalt, and testify to the foresight and wisdom of their constructors. They were constructed at great cost, but there is no one to-day that would have them removed or destroyed for many times their cost.

FEDERAL AID.

Much has been said about Federal aid for the construction of highways. The claim is made that it has never been the policy of the National Government to lend its aid for this purpose, and the Cumberland Road is mentioned as the only road in which the Government participated in its construction. I might say, in passing, that the Sixty-second Congress appropriated \$500,000 for this purpose. This sum was to be divided among the States according to population and miles of highway. None of it ever reached Michigan or many of the other States, for the reason that the States failed to qualify or conform to the provisions of the act. But this appropriation of \$500,000 did not go unused. It was used in the State of Ohio, which seemed to fall within the provisions of the act.

MICHIGAN TERRITORIAL HIGHWAY.

In the year 1825 the President of the United States, John Quincy Adams, was authorized to appoint commissioners to survey and mark a road from Detroit to Chicago. Three thousand dollars was appropriated for laying out the road. In 1827 Congress appropriated the sum of \$20,000 to aid in the construction of this road, and the act provided that the whole sum could be expended within the Territory of Michigan. The road

from Detroit to Chicago was designed to open up the West and make available the rich agricultural lands through that unbroken wilderness. And this road was also deemed important for the purpose of transporting munitions of war, provisions, and troops to points farther west. This is one of the reasons urged for making this appropriation 90 years after, and one of the benefits of the country should it ever be needed therefor. This highway had the efforts of Gen. Lewis Cass, and the road was located to be 100 feet wide between Detroit and Chicago; but the exhaustion of the appropriation made impossible the execution of the plan, and a highway following the Indian trail over which traveled those intrepid adventurers and explorers—Nicolet, first; then Marquette, La Salle, Joliet, Tonti, and other early missionaries, bearing the Christian cross. In 1832 the work on this great road was recommenced and completed thereafter. The bill for the Detroit and Chicago road passed the House February 2, 1825, and the Senate on March 2, 1825. It was signed by the President, and became a law on the last day of the session. It was fathered by Father Richard, who was a Delegate from the Territory of Michigan, entitled only to sit and have a voice, but had no vote thereon. Michigan Avenue in the city of Detroit and Michigan Avenue in Chicago are laid out along this route. It traversed a splendid country, and the modern cities and towns of Wayne, Ypsilanti, Ann Arbor, Chelsea, Jackson, Albion, Marshall, Battle Creek, Augusta, Galesburg, Kalamazoo, and Paw Paw, in Michigan, mark its trail.

The Legislature of Michigan of 1913 have designated this route a trunk line, and to-day the people of the State of Michigan and the counties and cities through which it passes are interested in constructing this Territorial highway laid out by the United States into a paved national highway, and before one century shall have rolled around from the laying out of this highway there is no question but what it will be transformed into a permanent and magnificent and useful paved highway, and practically along the same route. The people of Michigan are awake to the importance of good roads; they are also constructing a trunk line from Detroit to Lake Michigan through Lansing and Grand Rapids, and in a recent letter from the State highway commissioner of Michigan he says:

I feel quite safe in saying that no highway laws in any other State has resulted in producing so many miles of improved roads at so small a cost within 10 years after its enactment as the Michigan highway law.

Michigan has already built and completed 3,765 miles of roads, which have been accepted by the State, which will be increased to 4,000 miles at the close of the fiscal year, June 30. The Michigan law has most of the salient features of the present act, and under the able management of our highway commissioner great progress is being made in the construction of its highways.

Much might be said about the evolution of our public highways and their construction. The construction of good highways dates back centuries before the Christian era. The evolution from the ox cart to the locomotive and from the prairie schooner to the limousine has been no more rapid than that from the windmill to the electric current. Good roads bring people, communities, and their affairs together. They are necessary and consequential to our advancement and our prosperity, and, as stated here on the floor of the House, by a careful study of the past in road building may we find the path of our prosperity for the future. We are getting used to better things, and let poor roads go with the log cabin. [Applause.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this bill. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY].

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a short editorial on "Peace and the people," from the San Francisco Chronicle of January 6, 1916.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting the matter indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask upon what subject?

Mr. CALLAWAY. On "Peace and the people—commercial organizations of America prefer law to war and warlike preparations."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I yield back the balance of my time.

The article referred to is as follows:

PEACE AND THE PEOPLE—COMMERCIAL ORGANIZATIONS OF AMERICA PREFER LAW TO WAR AND WARLIKE PREPARATION.

The people back home are against the entire preparedness plan, says Representative SHERWOOD, of Ohio, who of all men can not be classed by the militarists as a coward. He fought in 42 battles of the Civil War, left the Army a general, and now, at the ripe age of 80, is ready to reenlist if danger threatens his country. Unable to see any signs of such danger, he describes the preparedness agitation as the engineering of "armament makers and militarists."

Here is a man who can not be opposed to universal and compulsory military service because he is afraid of being called to the colors. His age, his record, and his willingness to go into the trenches, if necessary, are sufficient reply to those who stigmatize all advocates of peace as cowards.

It is a cowardly charge, and for the simple reason that excessive preparedness is more the policy of the craven than of the courageous. The apostles of peace may be mistaken, but they are surely less afraid than those who would sacrifice the freedom of this Nation on the altar of conscription. If the question of bravery is involved in the merits of the controversy, the decision must go hard against those who see in every European and Asiatic army a possible invader of America.

But it is not a matter of courage and is solely one of common sense, and this latter scorns the fear of attack by any one or more of the crippled armies of Europe.

And it is not only the people back home who are against preparedness. The commercial organizations throughout the country are overwhelmingly opposed to militarism and strongly in favor of the settlement of international disputes by judicial tribunals. The vote taken by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States shows a very small percentage of business men who prefer preparedness to conciliation and military to economic pressure on nations resorting to war. The great majority pin their faith to law as arbiter of disputes and to economic forces as the influence with which to restrain the militaristic nations.

It is an instructive return, because it evidences the comforting truth that the armament makers and all others financially interested in preparedness are but a small fraction of the business men of America.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS]. [Applause.]

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I will not enter into any general discussion of the merits of this bill for the want of time. It seems to be conceded that good roads will be of great benefit to the country and to the farming communities. It would seem idle to take any time in a discussion of that branch of the subject. Those who have spoken in opposition to the bill have not taken the position that it will not be beneficial to the country districts in general. The principal objection to this bill, judging from what those who have spoken against it have said, is a kind of feeling or opposition arising in the cities because no portion of the money which will be expended will be applied to the construction of streets or roads within corporate limits of cities in excess of 2,000 inhabitants, except under certain conditions. This is the point to which I wish to address my remarks in answer to the position taken by those gentlemen representing urban districts and who are opposed to the proposition because they say it will be a burden upon the city for the benefit of the country.

In my capacity of Congressman at Large from the State of Illinois I represent both urban and rural communities—both city and country—and believe that I am in as good a position as any Member here to judge accurately of the benefits that will accrue to the whole country in common if this bill shall become a law. In my State is the finest expanse of agricultural lands in America, and within her borders is the second city in population and in some respects the greatest city on the continent.

The thought I have in mind is this: Every city is dependent upon the country, and whether it be New York City, to which city the whole country contributes, or whether it be Chicago, to which the great Central West contributes, or whether it be the county seat, to which the county contributes, the growth, the development, and the wealth of every city in the land depend upon the prosperity and the development of the territory contributory to that city. [Applause.] I have heard criticism of the bill because of the fact that it was limited in its operation to towns of under 2,000 inhabitants. I happen to live in a town larger than that, a very prosperous county seat. I am sure that the people of the community in which I live find no fault with this proposition or because no money will be expended on the streets within our corporate limits. We have in my county a number of hard roads leading into the county seat. The business men of the city of Pittsfield, in which I live, have contributed by donation largely to the construction of all these roads. I myself have contributed, and we are willing out of our own pockets individually to raise

funds to build up the roads which lead into our city. We are perfectly willing that the Federal Government shall substitute itself and assist in the construction of these highways, because we know that on the development of the surrounding country, extending out to the limits of the county, and on the prosperity of the rural districts depend the prosperity, growth, and development of the county seat.

I want to say this about the roads of Illinois: Some one yesterday, I believe it was the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood], criticized the Illinois roads. I was surprised and a little pained that one of my colleagues had to come to his feet and admit that the roads in Illinois were among the poorest of all the States of the Union. There are two reasons for this, if it is true. We have more roads than many sections of the country where topographical conditions are different than they are in the State of Illinois. We have a road on almost every section line. But the chief trouble with good roads in the State of Illinois lies in the character of our soil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Can I have five minutes more?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I have not the time.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Three, then.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield to the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. The character of our soil consists of prairie black loam, and I may say that during certain seasons of the year we have the best dirt roads in the country, and then there are seasons in the year in which we have the very worst dirt roads in the country. But the reason why we have not developed roads in Illinois lies largely in the fact of the inaccessibility of road material. It may be 100 miles, and is in many places, to the nearest material that can be used for road building. The farmers and the local authorities can not go to a neighboring gravel bed and secure the material. They have to transport their cement and other materials over the railroads and then cart it into the country where it is to be used for this purpose. These are the reasons why we have not better roads in the State of Illinois. And it is only within the last two or three years that we have undertaken by means of State aid to build good roads there. We now have a law by which the State contributes one-half. We have a State highway commission; we have a State road engineer. Roads have to be built under the direction of the highway commission, of the material which the State highway commission shall prescribe, and the State contributes one-half to the construction of those roads. When constructed the State takes them over and maintains them for all time.

We are entering upon an era of good roads in Illinois, and I will say to my friends in the East and those in the West who traverse the State of Illinois along the great national highways that they will in the near future, I apprehend, have less occasion to criticize our roads than at present. We realize that of all the great international highways from the East to the West, from coast to coast, four-fifths of them cross the State of Illinois. All of them projected north of the mouth of the Ohio River must of necessity cross the State of Illinois. We are contributing our share and will in the future do so, and I think it is not unfair, I think it is only proper, when this Government, in all its liberality, and I may say oftentimes its prodigality, in appropriating millions for various public purposes which go into the urban centers and upon our rivers and harbors, that a small proportion in the sum authorized in this bill should be appropriated to the construction of highways in the States. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEE].

Mr. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is not usually fruitful to discuss bills of this character in the Committee of the Whole in general debate; but, being friendly to the object of this legislation, I think it is my duty to point out what I think to be fallacies and imperfections in this bill as it now stands. We should be prepared when we

come into the Committee of the Whole, under the 5-minute rule, to drastically amend it.

That this bill is intended all right is perhaps true. It seems that while this piece of legislation is covered with good intentions, like the road leading to ruin or that other road running to Chicago are "paved with good intentions," good intentions will not carry it through.

The bill we have before us has been extolled by many gentlemen as a bill for the purpose of building and maintaining rural roads, thereby lightening the loads from the farm to the market. If that is the purpose of the bill, it must be amended. Otherwise it will be subject to the provisions of the pure-food law and the penalties for misbranding, because this bill is not for the purpose of building or maintaining a road from the farm to the market. It does not say so, and it does not give you the right to say so.

There are three or four features of the bill I desire to discuss. The first is that it is not a farmers' bill. It is a bill fathered by the automobilists. But I do not find any fault with it on that ground. Maybe it is better on that account. But the bill is not to be controlled in the interests of the rural roads. The bill is drawn so that every dollar of every appropriation in every State can be expended under the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture within the limits of the metropolises of the several States. I have called attention to that fact before, and I call it to your attention again. It says:

That for the purposes of this act the term "rural post road" shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is, or might be, carried outside of incorporated cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000 and in said cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000 along streets and roads where the houses average more than 200 feet apart.

Now, we will cite Chicago. Within the city of Chicago, beginning at its outer limit, there may be consecutive miles selected where the average distance between the houses is more than 200 feet. I will not say that the Secretary of Agriculture would, in the beginning, favor placing all the expenditures within the metropolitan limits. I do say he is given the power to place them there. That would give the people who live in the metropolis a potent force in saying where, if not within their city limits, that money will be expended. The result will be—as I think this bill intends it to be—that the roads will be constructed under State control. They will be simply State roads running across the State, to become connecting links with great interstate systems. With that I am not at war. But that is not what we have heard explained here as the purpose of the bill, and frankness to the public demands that we say so or amend the bill to conform with the other view.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. SLOAN. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. POWERS. I am in sympathy with the purposes of this legislation, but there are a good many features connected with it that I do not approve of. Is it not true that under the provisions of this bill the State highway department of any State, if it is a Republican State and they desire to do it, could have an improvement of roads exclusively in the Republican part of the State, and in a Democratic State they could do exactly the same thing?

Mr. SLOAN. Certainly; and the Secretary of Agriculture, be he Republican or Democrat, can say to the Representatives of a State of the opposing party, "If you desire to have a million-dollar improvement of roads in your State, I will cause to be contributed only 30 per cent, or \$300,000, while that State must contribute \$700,000, while in a favored State for a million-dollar improvement this Government will require the State to put up only \$500,000."

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes; briefly.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that whether the Secretary gives 30 per cent or 50 per cent on a particular road, it does not increase or decrease the amount that will be expended within that State for that year.

Mr. SLOAN. Within the discretion lodged with the Secretary of Agriculture, it authorizes him to say for every \$3 the Government puts up the State must pay up \$7, and if your annual quota is one-half million, as it is in Nebraska, under this bill to get all of it and prevent it lapsing back into the United States Treasury you must invest \$1,160,000.66, while your

neighbor State to obtain similar result must invest only \$500,000. I ask the chairman of this committee to read his own bill, because there is nothing in the bill that requires the expenditure of all the apportionment to the State. The Secretary can use his political power under this bill to say to the governor of a State, "If you want a million-dollar appropriation for improvement in your State, you must put up \$700,000 and I will put up only \$300,000." In another State, "If you want a million-dollar improvement, put up \$500,000 and we will put up the other \$500,000." That is the meaning of this bill.

Authority has been cited for the establishment of post roads. We find it in the Constitution. We find that it has been the subject of legislation. However, I do not know that we have any precedent in all the history of our country in the establishment of post roads where, when immediately upon the establishment through the funds of the Government, that that post road should be abandoned and jurisdiction over it absolutely surrendered.

That is one of the most serious vices of this proposed legislation. In this legislation we are not supposed to be representing our States in their sovereign capacities. Gentlemen at the other end of this Capitol will do that. We are supposed to represent the sovereignty of this Union and to look after the expenditures from the Treasury of this Union. Yet the effect of this bill is to demand of the Treasury from 30 per cent to 50 per cent contributions for the establishment and maintenance of roads, and immediately the Government's investment is complete in those roads the sovereignty is surrendered. When the money is invested, and within 30 seconds after the establishment of the road, the State can dislocate, relocate, or discontinue that road and destroy it. Under the terms of this bill there is not a condition which would require that State to respond either in forfeiture or in damages in any way or to any extent for lapse of that road.

The question was asked the other day what was the difference between this bill and the bill that was voted for in the last Congress. A large difference was this: Under the bill in the Sixty-third Congress there was to be an election of procedures. One where the Secretary of Agriculture should cooperate with the road-building authorities of the State. In that case there was no prohibition of the Government, after investing its money, proceeding to cooperate with the State in the maintenance and control of the highway so established.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The gentleman says the bill of last year provided that the Government should cooperate in maintaining the road?

Mr. SLOAN. Cooperate in its building; yes. In not saying that the complete control and jurisdiction should be given to the State it left the clear implication that who establishes shall enjoy and control.

The reason you left the election between that cooperation in building and control and the so-called leasing system which was the subject of choice was because you wanted the Government to contribute money to the construction of the road, but you did not want the Government to have any control.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Let us see if I understand the gentleman. Does he claim that under last year's bill the Government had control over the roads that it aided?

Mr. SLOAN. It would have if they elected under section 3 of last year's bill, but under section 4 of the same bill, which was the leasing section, it would not, and the reason is well understood by the gentleman from Virginia. It was in obedience to that doctrine which stands ready to receive money from the Government but refuses to give the Government any jurisdiction or control over the result of the expenditure of that money. To be perfectly plain, it is the ultra State-rights idea, that is ever willing and ready to put its hands into the Treasury of the United States and obtain money, but not willing to cooperate with the Government thereafter or permit the Government to have anything to say in the matter of the control. That is why the leasing proposition was submitted in the bill the last time. That system provided, not that the Government should cooperate in the building of the road, but that after the road was built, not as a matter of encouragement, but as a matter of reward, for a road of the highest class there should be paid \$60 per mile, for a road of the second class \$30 per mile, and for a road of the third class \$15 per mile. Under the present bill after the Government invests \$500,000 of its money in a million-dollar enterprise in any of the States, then this is how it will be disposed of. Page 4 of the bill provides—

That all construction and maintenance of roads under the provisions of this act shall be under the supervision and control of the State highway departments of the several States.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. The gentleman has stated his contention that the Government surrenders control over this road.

Mr. SAUNDERS. It does not surrender it. It never exercises it.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. But the only part the Government has in it is to contribute to its construction.

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. What is the particular objection to the State retaining jurisdiction and control over Government-aided roads and being responsible thereafter for their maintenance?

Mr. SLOAN. There would not be any objection if what is implied in your question was a fact; but the government of the State is not responsible to the Government of the United States for the maintenance of the road under this bill. That is one of the imperfections I want to see amended. It should be if a road be established that road should continue forever under joint control of State and Nation, or if the Government should see fit to surrender a measure of control after the road was completed and the State failed, neglected, or refused to maintain that road properly, it should forfeit to the Government of the United States such sum or sums as should be fixed by this Congress, collected under the direction of the Secretary.

Another serious objection to this bill is the provision practically compelling the States of the Union to adopt a highway commission or forfeit large sums of money. The Constitution and laws of the United States guarantee to the States protection in their republican form of government, which is commonly construed to mean a representative form of government. Further, it will not abide a State departing from such government. Yet now it proposes to force upon a State a commission, usually non-elective, and refuses to permit the Federal authority to continue to deal with the governor, elected by and responsible to the people.

I trust that the real friends of this legislation will see that proper amendments are made to this proposed law, the virtue of whose purpose is staggering under the weight of its crudities, imperfections, injustices, and unwarrantable grant of power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DUNN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP].

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to read a resolution passed by the Legislature of Virginia on this subject of good-roads legislation.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has for many years, and is now, making enormous appropriations of money for the improvement of our waterways and harbors and in the erection of public buildings; and

Whereas the great masses of the people of the State of Virginia and of the United States are deeply interested in the building and maintenance of our public highways; and

Whereas there is now pending in the House of Representatives of the United States a bill, which has been duly reported and on the calendar of that body, appropriating the sum of \$25,000,000, and of that amount giving to the State of Virginia the sum of \$591,214 for the purpose of the building of roads in the State of Virginia; and Whereas this bill is of the most vital importance to the people of Virginia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates of Virginia (the Senate concurring), That the Members of the Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States in both Houses be, and they are hereby, requested to support the aforesaid bill, or any similar measure, which will give the people of Virginia Federal aid in the construction of its public roads, and the clerk of this body is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each of the Senators and to each of the Members of the House of Representatives from Virginia forthwith after its adoption.

Agreed to by house of delegates January 19, 1916.

J. W. WILLIAMS, Clerk.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, the resolution just read was introduced in the Virginia House of Delegates by Hon. M. K. Lowry, and was unanimously adopted by the Legislature of Virginia. It expresses the attitude of the people of the State of Virginia on the subject of Federal aid to roads. With the resolution and with the bill before the House I most heartily sympathize. It should have the support of every Member who desires to pass legislation in the interest of the rural communities. The opponents of the bill have not advanced a single argument to support their contentions that could not with equal propriety be advanced against any Federal appropriation for any internal improvement whatever. While there is a demand for appropriation of money out of the Federal Treasury from many sources, the present bill would probably benefit a larger number of people than an appropriation of a similar amount for any other purpose of internal improvement. The bill has been very carefully drawn, has the support of both Democrats and Republicans of the Roads Committee, and has the indorsement

of the good roads organizations throughout the Union. It is a crystallization of the best thought of the best minds given to road legislation, and is entitled to the best consideration of the membership of this House. I have at other times given my reasons for supporting similar bills before the House, and I will not now consume the time of the House by repeating them. The bill will have my best support.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to my friend from Missouri, chairman of the committee, that this is Saturday afternoon, and we have had a long and hard week's work.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois has been so exceedingly kind, considerate, and helpful that I am constrained to act upon his suggestion, and I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee determined to rise; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BORLAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7617, to encourage the building of good roads, and had directed him to report that they had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. KONOP, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for 10 days, on account of illness in his family.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE GOULDEN.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to remind Members that memorial services will be held in the House to-morrow on the life, character, and public services of the late Representative JOSEPH A. GOULDEN.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Sunday, January 23, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, submitting an amendment to last subparagraph of Navy Department's letter of December 16, 1915, to include U. S. S. *Virginia* (H. Doc. No. 612); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting list of documents and files of papers which are not needed or useful in the transaction of current business of the department and have no permanent value or historical interest (H. Doc. No. 613); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9117) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Woolaston; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9307) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor Stahler; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7867) granting an increase of pension to Martin Johnson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CLARK of Florida, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6442) to provide for the exchange of the present Federal building site in Newark, Del., reported the same with amendment, accom-

panied by a report (No. 65), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 322) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to sell the old post office and site thereof in the city of Dayton, Ohio, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 66), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPSTICK: A bill (H. R. 9800) to increase the efficiency of the defenses of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 9801) for the relief of certain Army officers and their next of kin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 9802) for the investigation and control of the white-pine blister rust; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9803) to emancipate from certain disabilities children who have judgments of conviction for crime of record against them in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HENRY: A bill (H. R. 9804) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture on behalf of the United States to cooperate with the authorities of the States accepting this act in the construction of certain highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 9805) to establish the Mount Baker National Park in the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 9806) to provide that the United States shall, in certain cases, in order to encourage and promote agriculture and better to secure the national defense, aid the States and the civil subdivisions thereof in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 9807) to prevent the desecration of the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 9808) giving preference right to entrymen upon the public domain in certain cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 9809) for survey of inlet and basin at Venice, Cal.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 9810) to amend an act entitled "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891, known as the desert-land law; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SUMNERS: A bill (H. R. 9811) for the erection of a public building at Dallas, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE: A bill (H. R. 9812) to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. WILSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 9813) to consolidate certain forest lands in the Florida National Forest Reserve; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9814) for the relief of applicants to purchase lands granted to the Oregon & California Railroad Co.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BURKE: A bill (H. R. 9815) to amend subdivision A of section 4 and subdivision A of section 5 of the United States bankruptcy laws of July 1, 1898, and amendments thereto of February 5, 1903; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 9816) to provide for the erection of a public building at Mexia, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9817) to provide for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Teague, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 9818) providing that the Panama Canal rules shall govern in the measurement of vessels for imposing tolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9819) to amend the act of March 3, 1915, providing the time for the hold-

ing of United States court at Aiken, S. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 9820) for the purpose of limiting the activities of certain officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 9821) to prohibit the employment of any person who is not a citizen of the United States as radio operator or telegrapher on any vessel of the United States engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, and to establish the age of radio operators; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 9822) to provide for the retirement of employees in the Postal Service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9823) providing for equipment of apparatus and operators for radio communication at all life-saving stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 9824) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Pittsfield, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9825) to establish a military academy at some point in the State of Illinois, to be designated by the Secretary of War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 9826) to amend section 3362 of the Revised Statutes relating to tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 9827) providing for the retirement of officers of the Philippine Scouts, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 9828) granting a pension to Commodore P. Ellis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9829) granting a pension to Susan E. Nash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 9830) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Stubbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 9831) granting a pension to Frank A. Howell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 9832) granting an increase of pension to Katherine Betz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 9833) granting an increase of pension to Edwin C. Albertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 9834) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Heath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 9835) for the relief of Frank Hartman; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAMILL: A bill (H. R. 9836) for the relief of the Duncan Building & Loan Association, of Jersey City, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9837) for the relief of the Woodlawn Building & Loan Association, of Jersey City, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9838) for the relief of the Monticello Mutual Building & Loan Association, of Jersey City, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9839) for the relief of the Columbia Building & Loan Association, of Jersey City, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 9840) granting a pension to Nancy Proctor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 9841) granting a pension to Harris D. Williamson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 9842) granting a pension to Charles C. Watson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9843) granting a pension to Esther B. Woodard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 9844) granting an increase of pension to Robert Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9845) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Albert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9846) for the relief of Amanda McGhee; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9847) for the relief of Alfred Birch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 9848) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9849) granting an increase of pension to George W. McKelvey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9850) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan C. Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOD: A bill (H. R. 9851) for the relief of Sarah F. Trenwith, executrix of Clifford W. Simpson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOPWOOD: A bill (H. R. 9852) for the relief of Peter Michel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9853) for the relief of Hays Gaskill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULBERT: A bill (H. R. 9854) granting a pension to John Coombs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9855) granting a pension to Thomas P. McSherry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 9856) granting to the St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co., and to the Anheuser-Busch Brewing Association, and to the Manufacturers' Railway Co. permission to transfer certain rights of easement for railway purposes heretofore granted by the United States to the St. Louis & Iron Mountain Railroad Co. and to the Anheuser-Busch Brewing Association, respectively; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9857) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin L. Sayler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 9858) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Baltzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 9859) granting an increase of pension to Mandana C. Thorp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 9860) granting a pension to Michael Kilrow; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 9861) granting a pension to Isidore Cohen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9862) for the relief of the estate of R. O. Haskins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOONEY: A bill (H. R. 9863) granting a pension to Alonzo Hutchison; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9864) granting a pension to Wilsie Lippincott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9865) granting a pension to Louis Settles; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9866) granting a pension to Catherine McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9867) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9868) granting an increase of pension to William W. Sparks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9869) granting an increase of pension to Frank Nesbaum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9870) granting an increase of pension to George W. Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9871) granting a pension to Adam Mikel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9872) granting an increase of pension to David Leeper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9873) granting an increase of pension to Thornton Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9874) granting an increase of pension to Leroy Knight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9875) granting a pension to Annie Hoover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9876) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Heston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9877) granting an increase of pension to Alvanes P. Henery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9878) granting a pension to Mary I. Gregg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9879) granting a pension to Marion Gregory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9880) granting an increase of pension to William Jackson Gilpin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9881) granting an increase of pension to George W. Flesher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9882) granting a pension to Barbara E. Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9883) granting an increase of pension to James M. Beggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9884) granting an increase of pension to John Beckett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9885) granting an increase of pension to Henry Lee Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9886) granting an increase of pension to James M. Albaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9887) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9888) granting an increase of pension to Emma C. Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9889) granting a pension to Amanda White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURRAY: A bill (H. R. 9890) granting an increase of pension to John C. Maddox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTH: A bill (H. R. 9891) granting a pension to Annie S. Lytle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 9892) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Stafford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9893) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Pendell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9894) granting an increase of pension to Justine Patzack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9895) granting a pension to Michael E. Urell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9896) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Dunahey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POUL: A bill (H. R. 9897) for the relief of T. L. Love, surviving partner of Robert Love & Son; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9898) for the relief of John E. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 9899) granting a pension to James Hayden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9900) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Charles W. Wooden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9901) to place upon the rolls and records the name of George R. Gary and granting him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 9902) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint John W. Hyatt a first lieutenant of Infantry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 9903) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 9904) to correct the military record of Benton V. Stone; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Workmen's Circle, Branch 429, favoring House joint resolution 38, for congress of neutral nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of joint board Furriers' Union, of Greater New York, favoring House joint resolution 38, relative to congress of neutral nations to offer mediation to the belligerents; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES: Petitions of citizens of Anson, bankers and other citizens of Colwich, and bankers and other citizens of Geuda Springs, all in the State of Kansas, protesting against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE: Petition of Hand Knit Hosiery Co., of Sheboygan, Wis., asking for passage of House bill 702, "to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petitions of citizens of Sedan and Girard, Kans., protesting against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring an embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY: Memorial of boards of supervisors of Solano and other California counties, favoring legislation for preservation of California oil industry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Memorial of Pacific Fisheries Society, Seattle, Wash., relative to certain appropriations to the United States Bureau of Fisheries; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of St. Paul Commercial Club, protesting against tax on gasoline and automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mississippi River Levee Association, relative to plan to prevent floods in Mississippi River Basin; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of National Federation of Implement and Vehicle Dealers' Associations, favoring nonpartisan tariff board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul, Minn., favoring construction of a suitable building in which to care for the monuments of the American people; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of Aronsohn Bros. Silk Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of North Olmsted Congregational Church, favoring amending the pure food and drugs act relative to curative powers of a bottle of medicine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of North Olmsted Congregational Church, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of North Olmsted Congregational Church, favoring Federal censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of August Lehmann and 27 others of Prairie du Sac, and E. G. Jewel and 29 others of Hillsboro, all in the State of Wisconsin, favoring passage of the Burnett Immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of Henry Street Settlement, New York, favoring passage of child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of New York, favoring passage of House bill 2638, for claims of railway mail clerks for injuries received while on duty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of merchants of Morris, Ill., favoring a tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Morris (Ill.) Fiber Board Co. and Morris Cable Co., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Bay State Insulated Wire & Cable Co., favoring tariff on dye-stuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLYNN: Petition of Ansonia (Conn.) Electrical Co. and Waterbury Button Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petitions of Manheim Hosiery Co., of Manheim, and sundry citizens of Ephrata and Lancaster, Pa., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Papers to accompany House bill 8727, granting an increase of pension to Leroy Litchfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 8728, granting an increase of pension to Jonathan H. Slocum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: Paper to accompany House bill 9749, for the relief of the New Mexico Insane Asylum, of Las Vegas, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Papers to accompany House bill 9754, granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Harvey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULBERT: Petition of board of trade, New York, protesting against any further tax on real estate in New York; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Theatrical Protective Union, New York, protesting against tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IGOE: Memorial of Phineas Towne, of St. Louis, Mo., urging the adoption of the Keating bill to pension veterans of the Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition of citizens of Wisconsin, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Camile J. Day and others, of Appleton, Wis., protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of sundry tradespeople of New York, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: Petitions of sundry citizens of Lee, Pawpaw, Amboy, Harmon, Albany, Tampico, Prophetstown, Erie, Morrison, and Thomson, all of Illinois, favoring bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petitions of Toohey Silk Mills, of Watertown, and Diana Paper Co., of Harrisville, all of the State of New

York, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of George E. Cox & Bro., of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NOLAN: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., favoring legislation in interest of oil industry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Lodi, Cal., favoring passage of Newlands-Broussard river-regulation bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., favoring legislation authorizing the appointment of a commission to investigate and recommend on the desirability of the waters of San Francisco Bay or the waters tributary thereto for a naval base; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, telegrams from the county clerks of San Benito, Contra Costa, Placer, Sutter, Merced, Sacramento, Eldorado, San Mateo, Alameda, Martin, Fresno, San Joaquin, Madera, Monterey, Tuolumne, Colusa, Sonoma, Butte, Calaveras, Santa Clara, Solano, Glenn, and San Francisco Counties, stating that resolutions have been passed by their respective boards of supervisors, favoring the passage of remedial legislation for the benefit of the oil operators in the State of California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NORTON: Resolution adopted by the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) District Medical Society, favoring adequate provision in the reorganization of the Army for a sufficient number of medical officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of H. M. Sherman, N. E. Cull, N. H. Dahle, J. Freesene, Ed Lemeley, Perry Brown, H. O. Kell, C. C. Marks, S. L. Arneson, G. C. Drogge, Alfred Arneson, George Kjos, Olaf Ostness, H. M. Anderson, A. J. Roisum, Arthur E. Prior, and other citizens of Renville County, N. Dak., in opposition to program for military and naval preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution by the Burleigh County (N. Dak.) Farmers' Union, opposing the propaganda for preparedness and urging the enactment of a law providing for national standards for grain grading and inspection; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition from merchants of Reeder, N. Dak., urging the enactment of legislation which will compel concerns selling goods direct to consumers entirely by mail to contribute their portion of funds in the development of the local community, the county, and the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLATT: Petitions of the Firth Carpet Co., of Firth-cliff, and Yazoo Mills, of Pleasant Valley, N. Y., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Benjamin W. Topping, of Elmira, N. Y., favoring a retired list for volunteer officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Karl F. Burgess, of Ithaca, N. Y., protesting against the preparedness program, both military and naval; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio: Petition of G. G. Updike and others, protesting against the proposed lengthening and motorizing of mail routes out of Troy, Miami County, Ohio; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of E. D. Shields and others, protesting against proposed lengthening and motorizing of rural free-delivery route No. 11 out of the post office at Greenville, Darke County, Ohio, and requesting that said route remain unchanged; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Nathan Thompson and others, protesting against the lengthening and motorizing of rural mail routes out of Ludlow Falls, Miami County, Ohio; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition of sundry citizens of Albany, N. Y., favoring passage of bill for censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Additional papers in pension case of Henry P. Bliss, H. R. 8898; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 6722, in pension case of Cyrenous Dalley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the editor of Liberty Magazine, C. S. Long-acre, favoring introduction through the House post office for distribution of Liberty Magazine among Representatives; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of John B. Andrews, secretary American Association for Labor Legislation, favoring passage of House bill 446 Federal employees compensation bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Memorial of General Leonard Wood Camp, No. 8, Department of Florida, favoring passage of bill for widows' pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of B. H. McCalla Camp, No. 5, United Spanish War Veterans, of Key West, Fla., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Providence (R. I.) Council, No. 95, Knight of Columbus, favoring a bill to make Columbus Day, October 12, a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of executive committee of Rhode Island Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Memorial of Devils Lake District Medical Association, favoring selection of Army surgeons from the medical profession; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SUNDAY, January 23, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by Mr. FITZGERALD as Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our hearts turn to Thee, our Father in heaven, as we assemble here to-day in memory of a deceased Member of this House whose life and public services challenge the admiration of all who knew him. As a young man in his teens he answered the call of President Lincoln for volunteers to preserve the integrity of the Union, and proved himself a brave and gallant soldier on many a field of battle. When the war was over he returned to his home and took up the life of a civilian and made himself a worthy and valuable citizen. Wherever he was called, in city, State, or Nation, he served with distinction. His genial character, splendid personality, and generous impulses made him a favorite. Here on the floor of this House, where he served for many years, he was noted for his fidelity and efficiency, a consistent member of his chosen church. Long may his memory live and inspire others to emulate his virtues. Be Thou a comfort to those who knew him best, especially to the members of his immediate family, that they may look forward with hope in the blessed promise of the life immortal, through Him who taught us the continuity of that life and illustrated in the glorious resurrection. Amen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the Journal. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE GOULDEN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the special order.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. BENNET, by unanimous consent. *Ordered*, That Sunday, January 23, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon, be set apart for addresses upon the life, character, and public services of Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York offers a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 101.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity be given for tribute to the memory of Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, late a Member of this House from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That at the conclusion of to-day's proceedings the House, as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his distinguished public career, do stand adjourned.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Speaker, when the Sixty-fourth Congress convened, Col. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN failed to answer to his name because on May 3, 1915, he had responded to the final roll call of the Supreme Ruler of the Universe. When I recall his efficient and faithful service and glorious record of splendid legislative achievement and then take a retrospective